MAW
G/A449B

A

Review of all the Doctrines

TAUGHT BY

The Rev. Mr. JOHN WESLEY;

CONTAINING,

A Full and Particular ANSWER to a Book entitled,

"A Second Check to Antinomianism,"

In SIX LETTERS to the Rev. Mr. F——R.

Wherein the DOCTRINES of

A TWOFOLD JUSTIFICATION, FREE WILL, MAN'S MERIT, SINLESS PERFECTION, FINISHED SALVATION, and REAL ANTINOMIANISM,

ARE PARTICULARLY DISCUSSED;

AND

The PURITAN DIVINES and PROTESTANT CHURCHES Vindicated from the Charges brought againſt them of holding Mr. WESLEY's Doctrines.

TO WHICH ARE ADDED,

A FARRAGO;

And Some REMARKS on the

"Third Check to Antinomianiſm."

By the AUTHOR of PIETAS OXONIENSIS.

The SECOND EDITION. Corrected and Enlarged.

And not rather, as we be *ſlanderouſly reported*, and as ſome affirm that we ſay, Let us do evil that good may come; whoſe damnation is juſt. *Rom.* iii. 8.

"I would I knew where to find you; then I could take a direct aim. Whereas now I muſt rove and conjecture. To-day you are in the tents of the Romaniſts; tomorrow in ours; next day, between both, againſt both. Our adverſaries think you ours, we theirs; your conſcience finds you with both and neither. I flatter you not; this of yours is the worſt of all tempers.—WILL YOU BE A CHURCH ALONE? Alas! how full are you of contradictions to yourſelf! How full of contrary purpoſes! How oft do you chide with yourſelf! How oft do you fight with yourſelf!"

Bp. Hall's Letter to W. L. expoſtulating with him on his Unſettledneſs in Religion.

LONDON,

Printed for E. and C. DILLY, in the Poultry. 1772.

MAW
G/A 449 B

A

REVIEW

OF

All Mr. Wesley's Doctrines,

&c. &c. &c.

LETTER I.

Reverend Sir,

AFTER many debates with myſelf, and much ſolicitation from my friends, you now hear from me again, on the ſubject of your laſt piece, entitled, *A Second Check to Antinomianiſm.* I make no other apology for writing, than that I think there is an abſolute neceſſity an anſwer ſhould be given to it; and I heartily wiſh that the dear and worthy miniſter to whom your Letters are addreſſed (and whoſe ſuperior gifts, graces, and abilities for ſuch a work, I acknowledge with the moſt unfeigned reſpect), were to take up the pen inſtead of myſelf; but in conſideration of his continual labours in the miniſtry, and conſequently of the little leiſure he has for controverſial employment, I ſhall eſteem it an honour conferred on *the leaſt of all ſaints*, if he will permit me to act the part of his ally, in what I am perſuaded

ſuaded is *the cauſe of God, and of truth.* But whilſt I make my animadverſions on your Letters, may the Divine Author of Love and Meekneſs preſerve me from the unhappy ſpirit in which they are written! Oh, my dear Sir! I never could have ſuppoſed that ſneer, banter, and ſarcaſm, yea, notorious falſehood, calumny, and groſs perverſions, would have appeared before the world under the ſanction of your venerable name: And although I thought there might be ſome parts of Mr. Shirley's Narrative which would not entirely meet with your approbation, yet I was perſuaded you would have told him ſo with a pen dipped in honey, but not in gall: Eſpecially as Mr. Weſley had expunged, what he thought, *all the tart expreſſions* from your firſt book; though it is ſtill viſible that the obſervation of Mr. Shirley concerning it is but too well founded; viz. *If the tart expreſſions are expunged, many bitter ones yet remain:* And notwithſtanding you would ſeem to make a conceſſion for theſe, yet it is evidently a *forced* and *unmeaning*, if not a *ſarcaſtic* one; for you ſay (p. 47), "For every bitter "expreſſion that may have dropped from *my ſharp vindicating* "*pen*, I aſk you pardon, but it muſt be in general, for neither "friends nor foes have yet particularly pointed out to me one "ſuch expreſſion."

But not to dwell any longer on the *manner* in which you have defended your cauſe, I proceed to conſider the *matter* of your performance. But before I do this, would beg to preſent you with an extract from a dear friend's letter, whoſe great love and attachment to Mr. F——r, muſt convince him that nothing but the perſuaſion of his having given up the moſt glorious truths of the Goſpel, could ever have made her give up the opinion ſhe once had of him as a miniſter of Chriſt; as alſo that the ſevere acrimonious ſpirit of his late works is not leſs viſible to others, than to myſelf. The Lady I mean, writing to one of the few great and honourable among the choſen of Chriſt, thus expreſſeth herſelf:

"I have been looking into Mr. F——r's *Second Check to* "*Antinomianiſm*; he was permitted no doubt to print it for "wiſe ends; but indeed it is moſt awful to ſee how this mighty "man is fallen, *how the fine gold is become dim.* O my dear "friend, I can ſcarce refrain from dropping a tear whilſt "I write. My heart has been made heavy on account of this "publication, by a man whom I once revered as an Angel of "God, and at whoſe feet I have ſat with great delight to hear "the precious truths which flowed from his lips: but he now "ſeems *turned aſide unto vain janglings.* The very ludicrous "manner in which he treats THE FINISHED SALVATION

"OF

" OF CHRIST, is enough to make every child of God ſhud-
" der, who is convinced of the inſufficiency of his own
" righteouſneſs for acceptance, and whoſe truſt is in the alone
" merits of Jeſus the Mediator."

Another dear friend of yours and mine, one who always eſteemed you *very highly in love*, thus expreſſeth himſelf, in a letter upon the occaſion: " Who would have
" thought that dear Mr. F——r ſhould have been the author
" (of the Second Check to Antinomianiſm)? I did not ſee
" it till lately, and am ſorry to ſay that it ſeems to me to be
" as full of ſenſible ſpleen, as of groundleſs and falſe argu-
" ments. Let us pray for the author, and confute him by
" *ſpiritual motion* [A]. If his axioms are untrue, unleſs the
" merciful Jeſus, whoſe immaculate Righteouſneſs he hath ſo
" horridly ſet at nought, reverſe the ſentence, the *idle words* of
" that book will undo all that he has been doing. I hence
" *learn not to be high-minded, but to fear leſt I ſhould fall*
" *after the ſame example.*"

A third, a faithful miniſter of Chriſt, to whom you have always been peculiarly dear, thus writes: " It really hurts me
" to cut off all intercourſe and friendſhip with Mr. F——r,
" whom I once ſo highly eſteemed. I ſincerely pity him.
" He ſeems to be ſo infatuated and carried away with a falſe
" zeal to ſerve the cauſe he is engaged in, that he appears
" quite inſenſible to what length he has run, how widely he
" has deviated from the rule of truth, and in what manner he
" has ſneered at the doctrines of grace, and expoſed to con-
" tempt and cenſure thoſe who ſtand up for them! However,
" if he ſhould revoke the pernicious doctrines he has advanced,
" and repent of the bitter expreſſions in his late publications, I
" don't know any miniſter I ſhould be more diſpoſed to honour."

YOUR firſt letter is almoſt wholly employed in defence of the doctrine of *a ſecond Juſtification by works*. Whether or no Mr. *Weſley's* declaration made at the laſt Briſtol conference, be compatible with ſuch a doctrine, is not much to the purpoſe; ſaying and unſaying is nothing new with one who has only ſhewn himſelf conſiſtent by a regular ſeries of inconſiſtencies. But I venture to appeal to the integrity of the pious worthy men, who ſigned it after Mr. *Weſley*, whether they had the leaſt idea at that time that the declaration would

[A] Alluding to the philoſopher who denied there was any ſuch thing as motion; which one hearing, got up and confuted him by walking in his preſence.

or could ſtand with any ſuch ſyſtem as that contended for by Mr. Oliver, and ſince defended by Mr. F——r? It is plain that Mr. Oliver thought it would not, and therefore he very properly refuſed to ſign it; and if the reſt of the preachers then aſſembled had been of Mr. Oliver's opinion in the matter of a ſecond Juſtification by works, (notwithſtanding you have ſo peremptorily anſwered for them all) I dare ſay they would every one of them have followed his example, and would not have ſet their hands to that which in their hearts they could never aſſent to.

With regard to the doctrine itſelf, I may ſafely affirm, that as it has no exiſtence in the word of God, ſo neither in any Proteſtant church under Heaven; and therefore we find that all the awakened Divines, who lived at or near the time of the Reformation, as well among the Puritans, as of our own communion, whenever they combated the notion of a ſecond Juſtification by works, always took it for granted that ſuch notion was only held within the Romiſh pale [B], and that all Proteſtants were unanimous in aſſerting the one complete, final, everlaſting Juſtification of ſinners by faith only in Jeſus Chriſt. That this is the caſe, will appear from the following extract from that ſound, learned, holy, and evangelical Prelate of our church, Biſhop Cowper, who, in his Comment on Rom. viii. 30, ſtating the controverſy between us and the Papiſts relative to a firſt and ſecond Juſtification, thus writes: "Their third "evaſion is by a diſtinction of the firſt and ſecond Juſtification; "the firſt whereof (ſay they) is *by faith*, but the ſecond is *by* "*works*; but this twofold Juſtification is alſo forged; for "*Juſtificatio eſt actus individuus & ſimul totus*; there is no "firſt and laſt in the act of Juſtification: He that is once con-"demned judicially ſtands ſo; and he that is abſolved ſtands ſo. "Again, this diſtinction confounds two benefits, Juſtification "and Sanctification, which *to them* is the ſecond Juſtification. "That they *are* diſtinct benefits the Apoſtle doth teach us, ſay-"ing, *Chriſt is made unto us Righteouſneſs and Sanctification*;

[B] Dr. Fulke (on Rom. ii. 13) tells the Rhemiſh Jeſuits, "As for "YOUR diſtinction of a firſt and ſecond Juſtification before God, it "is but a new device, not threeſcore years old, utterly unheard-of "among the antient fathers."

In like manner good old Mr. Perkins, who lived in the time of Queen Elizabeth, tells the Papiſts, that "they were forced to caſt "about for that as falſe as new diſtinction of Juſtification into the *firſt* "and *ſecond*, never heard of for the ſpace of fifteen hundred years "after Chriſt." *Perkins*, vol. III. p. 599.

"but

" but they inconſiderately confound them; for if theſe new " qualities infuſed by grace into the ſoul of man, and good " works flowing therefrom, be the matter (as they ſay) of " man's ſecond Juſtification, then let them tells us, what is the " matter of his Sanctification."

What the good biſhop here advances upon the confounding Juſtification with Sanctification is well worth attending to; eſpecially as this doctrine muſt neceſſarily make way for another exploded hereſy of the Romiſh church; viz. *the increaſe of the ſecond Juſtification*, according to the degrees and meaſures of holineſs and good works which are produced in the heart and life. And hence it is that we find, when Mr. Hervey aſſerts in his Theron and Aſpaſio, " That Juſtification is complete " the firſt moment we believe, and is incapable of augmenta- " tion," Mr. Weſley anſwers, " Not ſo; *there may be as many* " *degrees in the favor, as in the image of God* [C]." And Mr. F——r, (p. 9.) where he is attempting to prove, that in the laſt day *we ſhall not be juſtified by faith, but by the fruits* of *faith*; viz. *love and good works*, declares in ſtill more forcible terms, " *That love and good works are the* ETERNAL MEA- " SURES, *according to which God* DISTRIBUTES JUSTIFI- " CATION and glory in the world to come [D]."

But if this doctrine be true, then there muſt be a certain period in every believer's experience between his firſt and ſecond Juſtification, until he ſhall have produced ſuch a DEGREE and MEASURE of ſanctification and good works as ſhall be neceſſary

---

[C] Mr. Hervey well obſerves upon this aſſertion of Mr. Weſley, that " Juſtification is one ſingle act of divine grace, and muſt therefore " be either done or undone. If done, in the very idea of the act it " includes completeneſs; ſo that to ſpeak of incomplete Juſtification is " a contradiction in terms; like ſpeaking of a dark ſunſhine, or a " round ſquare." He then proceeds to ſhew, that this ſentiment naturally makes way for a gradual, a variable, and even a half Juſti- fication; and that by turning upon a ſuppoſition, that the favor of God towards us is occaſioned by the image of God in us, it is the doctrine of the law, the very language of Heatheniſm, and has not the leaſt ſavor of the Goſpel, in which CHRIST IS ALL. Letter iv. p. 78.

[D] Though neither our Lord, nor the Apoſtles, nor Prophets, have either ſaid a ſingle ſyllable of this notion, yet Mr. Weſley and Mr. F——r have the whole council of Trent on their ſide, one of whoſe canons thus dogmatizes: " If any ſhall affirm that righteouſneſs re- " ceived is not preſerved, and *increaſed* likewiſe by good works; but " that good works are only the fruits and evidences *(ſigna)* of Juſti- " fication obtained, not the means of *increaſing* it alſo, let him be " accurſed." Seſſ. vi. can. 24.

to bring him into the ſtate of ſecond Juſtification. If you deny this, and ſay there is no ſuch intermediate ſtate, then you overthrow your own argument, and your diſtinction is utterly needleſs. For inſtance, let us ſuppoſe a ſinner freely juſtified by faith only in Chriſt; is that ſinner the ſame hour partaker of a ſecond Juſtification by works? If you ſay *no*, you allow the intermediate ſtate between the two Juſtifications which I affirm your doctrine muſt end in. If you ſay *yes*, then you immediately level to the ground all the Babel you have been erecting.

The caſe of the penitent thief appeared a formidable rampart againſt your doctrine, therefore you have endeavoured to ſcale this rampart as well as you could, by attempting to prove that this thief was juſtified by his *reproofs*, *exhortations*, *prayers*, *patience and reſignation*, *all of which* plainly *evidenced the livelineſs of his faith*, as there was *time and opportunity*; *and by his love to God and man he fulfilled all the Law*, *and did all good works in one*. You then ſum up the argument by aſking, Is not the fulfilling of ALL the law of Chriſt *work enough to juſtify the converted thief by that law?* Work enough indeed! But of all the millions of ſouls now in glory, perhaps this poor thief had the leaſt thought of ever being produced as an example of Juſtification by the merit of his own good works. And that the Primitive Fathers, and the Reformers of our own church did ever eſteem this as one of the moſt glorious inſtances of free grace recorded in the Scriptures, and therefore would have been equally ſhocked and aſtoniſhed to ſee it perverted to countenance the new-fangled conceit of a twofold Juſtification, is moſt evident from the following quotation out of the Homily of Salvation, which I chooſe to tranſcribe from Mr. Weſley's extract, the words themſelves being taken from St. Chryſoſtom. "I can ſhew a man that by faith without works lived and came "to Heaven: But without faith never man had life. The "thief that was hanged when Chriſt ſuffered, did BELIEVE "ONLY, and the moſt merciful God juſtified him. *Faith "by itſelf ſaved him*, but works by themſelves never juſtified "any man." *Hom. of Salvation* [E].

But to follow you in this example yet further. You aſk, *Could he go into Paradiſe without being born again?* I anſwer, certainly he could not. And in my turn permit me to aſk, if

---

[E] See alſo Mr. Weſley's ſermon on Eph. ii. 8, where he affirms, that the thief was juſtified without bringing forth fruits meet for repentance; and is much diſpleaſed at a late writer, who would make this thief "a very honeſt and reſpectable perſon."

he

he could be born again without being juſtified? If you alſo anſwer in the negative, then I reply, that his free Juſtification by faith in Chriſt, and his being born from above were both effected at once, and therefore he could not be juſtified a ſecond time, either by love or his new birth, which both took place at his Juſtification. It is true, all holy habits were infuſed into his ſoul upon his believing; and had he lived he would no doubt have brought them into act; but to talk of his being juſtified a ſecond time, by *the fulfillment of all the law of Chriſt*, is a perverſion not leſs notorious than bringing the inſtance of our Lord's raiſing Lazarus, in your firſt Pamphlet (p. 41), to ſupport the doctrine of man's natural abilities and free will [F].

But you will tell me, I have not yet anſwered the texts of Scripture which you have produced in favor of a ſecond Juſtification by works. I own, I am glad to have an opportunity of laying them plainly before the eyes of my candid reader, that he may judge, without prejudice, how very feebly they ſupport your doctrine. You introduce them indeed with a very confident preface, as if they were originally intended for the ſervice into which you have preſſed them; but a ſmall degree of diſcernment will reſtore them to their true meaning.

Your words are theſe: "Neither you, Rev. Sir, nor any "divine in the world, have, I preſume, a right to blot out of "the ſacred records thoſe words of Jeſus Chriſt, St. James, "and St. Paul: Bleſſed are they that do his commandments, "that they may have *right* [G] to the tree of life. Not every "one that ſays to me, Lord, Lord, ſhall enter into the kingdom "of Heaven, but he that does the will of my Father. Be ye "therefore doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving "yourſelves. For as we are under the law to Chriſt, not the "hearers of the law ſhall be juſt before God, but the doers of "the law ſhall be juſtified. Every man's works ſhall be made

---

[F] Mr. F——r ſays that, "Inſtead of imitating Lazarus, who, "when our Lord had called him, and reſtored life to his putrefying "body, came forth out of his grave, though he was bound hand and "foot, theſe miſtaken men indolently wait till the Lord drags them "out." But Mr. F——r ſhould have conſidered, that Lazarus would have lain till this time if he who called him had not given both life and power to come forth.

[G] The word in the Greek is ἐξουσιαν, which properly ſignifies *privilege*; and therefore even biſhop Hoadly, ſpeaking on this paſſage, could ſay, "Such as allow themſelves to pick ſingle texts of Scripture, without comparing them with the whole, and with each "other, may from theſe places collect *the Romiſh Doctrine of merit*."
Terms of Acceptance.

" manifeſt: For the day ſhall declare it, becauſe it ſhall be " revealed by fire, and the fire ſhall try every man's work of " what ſort it is. *His very words ſhall undergo the ſevereſt* " *ſcrutiny:* I ſay unto you *(O how many will inſinuate the con-* " *trary?)* that every idle word that men ſhall ſpeak they ſhall " give account thereof in the day of judgment, for by thy " words ſhalt thou then be juſtified, and by thy words ſhalt " thou then be condemned."

Now, Sir, is it poſſible that you can build the ſyſtem of a ſecond Juſtification by works upon the above Scriptures? For my own part, I can no more admit your hypotheſis from them, than I would deny their force when brought to affirm that ſanctification and good works are the certain fruits and evidences of a juſtified ſtate, both here and at the day of judgment. You attempt, indeed, to make a diſtinction between a ſecond Juſtification by the *merit*, and by the *evidence* of works [H], and you would illuſtrate this diſtinction by the examples of Curſing Tom the Collier and Mr. Shirley's ſenſible boy. " Give me " leave, Sir, (ſay you, p. 29) to anſwer this objection by two " appeals, one to the moſt ignorant Collier in my Pariſh, and " the other to your own ſenſible Child; and if they can at " once underſtand my meaning, you will ſee that my meta- " phyſical diſtinctions, as you are pleaſed to call them, are " nothing but the dictates of common ſenſe. I begin with the " Collier.

" Thomas, I ſtand here before the judge, accuſed of hav- " ing robbed the Rev. Mr. Shirley, near Bath, laſt month, on " ſuch an evening: Can you ſpeak a word for me?" Thomas " turns to the judge," and ſays, " Pleaſe your honor, the accu- " ſation is falſe; for our parſon was in Madeley-Wood, and I " can make oath of it; for he even reproved me for ſwearing " at our pit's mouth that very evening." By his evidence the " judge acquits me. Now, Sir, aſk Curſing Tom, whether " I am acquitted and juſtified by his merits, or by the ſimple " evidence he has given? and he will tell you, " Aye, to be " ſure, by the evidence: Though I am no ſcholar, I know " very well, if our Methodiſt Parſon is not hanged, it is none " of my deſerving." Thus, Sir, an ignorant Collier, as great " a ſtranger to your metaphyſics as you are to his mandrel, " diſcovers at once a material difference between Juſtifica- " cation by the evidence, and Juſtification by the merits of a " witneſs."

[H] If Mr. F——r here calls the works of believers *evidences* only, why does he in other places ſo ſtrongly plead for the *merit* of them?

" My

" My ſecond appeal is to your ſenſible child. By a plain " compariſon I hope to make him at once underſtand both " the difference there is between our firſt and ſecond Juſtifica- " tion, and the propriety of that difference. The lovely boy " is old enough, I ſuppoſe, to follow the gardener and me to " yonder nurſery. Having ſhewn him the operation of graft- " ing, and pointing at the crab-tree newly grafted, " My " dear child, would I ſay, though hitherto this tree has pro- " duced nothing but crabs, yet by the ſkill of the gardener, " who has juſt fixed in it that good little branch, it is now " made an apple-tree: I juſtify and warrant it ſuch. [Here " is an emblem of our firſt Juſtification by faith!] In three or " four years, if we live, we will come again and ſee it: If " it thrives, and bears fruit, well; we ſhall then, by that mark, " juſtify it a ſecond time; we ſhall declare that it is a good " apple-tree indeed, and fit to be tranſplanted from this wild " nurſery into a delightful orchard. But if we find that the " old crab-ſtock, inſtead of nouriſhing the graft, ſpends all its " ſap in producing wild ſhoots and ſour crabs; or if it is a tree " whoſe fruit withereth without fruit, twice dead (dead in the " graft and in the ſtock) plucked up by the root, or quite " cankered, far from calling it a good tree, we ſhall paſs ſen- " tence upon it, and ſay, Cut it down; why cumbereth it the " ground? For every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit, is " hewn down, and caſt into the fire. Here is an emblem of " our ſecond Juſtification *by works*, or of the condemnation " that will infallibly overtake thoſe Laodicean profeſſors and " wretched apoſtates, whoſe faith is not ſhewn by works where " there is time and opportunity."

Now permit me to ſay that both theſe inſtances rather over-throw than ſupport your favourite ſcheme. For is not the Vicar of Madeley as much *not guilty* of the crime of robbery, before his pariſhioner Tom gives his evidence as after? His teſtimony indeed *proves* your innocence, but does in no *meaſure* or *degree* conſtitute that innocence, which is as complete and full before the witneſs is called in as after he has given his depoſition.

So in the caſe of the ingrafted tree; no ſooner is the cyon put in by the ſkilful hand of the Gardener, than immediately the nature of the tree is changed, and from the apples which it afterwards produces, we have undoubted *evidence* that the ſtem which was originally wild, partakes of the fatneſs of the graft which was put into it. But what more do theſe familiar inſtances prove in ſpirituals, than that all thoſe who are abſolved from the curſe of the law, and are by faith ingrafted into Chriſt by the unerring hand of the divine huſbandman, will bring forth much

fruit

fruit to the glory of God, and that ſuch fruit will *prove* before men here, and before aſſembled angels and men at the day of judgment, that they were not dead, withered branches, but ſuch as were fed and nouriſhed by ſap from the true and living vine? but neither the texts you have cited, nor your examples in ſupport of them, any more prove a ſecond Juſtification than they prove a ſecond glorification [I].

However, as you have quoted one text no leſs than five or ſix times in your firſt letter, and ſeem to lay an uncommon ſtreſs upon it, I ſhall pay a more particular attention to it. Mat. xii. 36. *Every idle word that men ſhall ſpeak, they ſhall give an account of at the day of judgment. For by thy words thou ſhalt* then *be juſtified, and by thy words thou ſhalt* then *be condemned.* We will take no notice of your interpolation of the word *then*; but, giving the paſſage its full ſcope, if you will pleaſe to compare it with the context, you will find that our Lord ſpoke the words to the Phariſees when they impiouſly affirmed that he wrought his miracles by the power of the wicked one. After confuting their argument, or rather indeed ſhewing how their argument confuted itſelf, he proceeds to point out the danger not only of blaſphemous words, but even of vain and idle words; and affirms that as every tree is known by its fruit, ſo may the true ſtate of the heart be known by the evil or good things which proceed out of the mouth; and having laid down this rule of judgment, he adds the words which you have ſo often cited in defence of your doctrine, *By thy words thou ſhalt be juſtified, and by thy*

[I] It is not a little remarkable, that Mr. Hervey, in his eleven excellent Letters to Mr. Weſley, after having ſhewn that the doctrines of a ſecond Juſtification by works, and of an increaſe of Juſtification, were confirmed by that famous Popiſh ſynod the council of Trent, againſt the Proteſtants, brings the very ſame example to prove our one, complete, preſent, and final Juſtification by faith alone, and that works are only the fruits, evidences, and effects of that Juſtification, as Mr. F——r brings to prove that we are really juſtified a ſecond time by works at the day of judgment. The following are Mr. Hervey's words: "Shall I ſend you to a familiar "illuſtration? I view from my window a young tree. The gar- "dener, when he planted it, told me, it was a fruit-tree; a pear- "tree; a right *beauté du roy*. It may be ſuch a tree, and have its "reſpective ſeed in itſelf, but this did not then appear. If, when "autumn appears, its branches are laden with fruit, with pears, "with that delicious kind of pears, this will be a *demonſtration* of "all thoſe properties. This will not make it ſuch a particular tree; "but only ſhew it to be of that fine ſort, or *make its nature or per-* "*fections evident.* Letters to Mr. Weſley, p. 95.

words

words thou ſhalt be condemned; *(i. e.)* As words and works are the ſtreams which flow from the ſpring of the heart, ſo by theſe it will appear whether that fountain was ever cleanſed and purified by grace, or whether it ſtill remains in its natural corrupt ſtate; the actions of a man being the *declarative evidences* both here and at the great day whether or no he was among the trees of righteouſneſs which the Lord hath planted [K]. This is the plain eaſy ſenſe of the paſſage; and indeed our Reformers ſeem to have had an eye to thoſe words of the context, "*Either make the tree good, and his fruit good, or elſe make the tree corrupt, and his fruit corrupt*; *for the tree is known* (*i. e.* is evidenced) *by its fruit*," when they drew up our 12th article, which aſſerts, that "A lively faith may be as evidently known by its "works, as a tree diſcerned by its fruit;" but the doctrine of a twofold Juſtification is not to be found in any part of the liturgy or offices of our church.

Much to the purpoſe is the following quotation from excellent Biſhop Cowper. "As every tree is known by the fruit, ſo "works of grace *prove* thoſe that have them to be trees planted "by predeſtination in the Paradiſe of God, by that river of "the water of life; and that therefore thy leaf ſhall not fade, "and thy root ſhall not periſh, becauſe thou art rooted and "grounded in Chriſt Jeſus, and groweſt in him, who ſhall "for ever conſerve the ſap of grace in thy ſoul.

"The adverſaries (the Papiſts) calumniate us, and call us "enemies to good works; but God forbid we were ſo. We

---

[K] The judicious Dr. Guiſe gives us the ſame interpretation. Paraphraſing on the place, he ſays, "Your words as well as actions "ſhall be produced in EVIDENCE for or againſt you, to *prove* "whether you are a ſaint or a ſinner, a true believer or not; and "according to their EVIDENCE you ſhall be either publicly ac-"quitted or condemned in the great day." *Guiſe in loco.*

The teſtimony of one more commentator ſhall be produced, in order to ſhew that this text hath nothing at all to do with a ſecond Juſtification, and that works are to be conſidered only as the proofs and evidences of true faith, both here and at the day of judgment. As this commentator is in your opinion *the greateſt miniſter in the world*, I hope his deciſion will end the controverſy between us. The Rev. Mr. John Weſley, in his notes on the New Teſtament, thus elucidates this portion of holy writ: "Your words as well as "actions ſhall be produced IN EVIDENCE for or againſt you, to "prove whether you was a *true believer* or not; and according to "that EVIDENCE you will either be acquitted or condemned in "the great day." In the mouth of theſe two witneſſes may the truth be firmly eſtabliſhed. *Weſley in loco.*

"con-

" condemn no good works, only we condemn their presump-
" tuous opinion of the *merit* of good works. *Meriting* causes
" of our salvation they are not, yet are they *witnessing effects*
" thereof; without which a man cannot be saved; not that
" we are saved by them, but because that justifying faith,
" whereby we *are* saved, cannot be without them; for faith
" works by love. In the act of Justification, we affirm, good
" works have no place; for a man must first be justified, before
" he do any good; *Nam sequuntur justificatum.*

" For that assertion of the Apostle, *We conclude that a man*
" *is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law*, is equivalent
" to this, that a man *is justified by faith only*. And from the
" Apostle, the ancient fathers have drawn this position, *Sola*
" *fide justificamur*. Basil, in his Treatise *De Confessione Fidei*,
" hath it, *Nos non habemus unde quicquam gloriemur de justitia,*
" *cum ex solâ fide in Christum justificamur*. We have not
" whereof to glory of righteousness, seeing we are justified by
" faith only in Christ Jesus. And more notable is that testimony
" of Ambrose, *Justificantur gratis quia nihil operantes, neque*
" *vicem reddentes, sola fide justificati sunt, dono Dei*. By this
" one sentence he cuts away from Justification their works,
" both of congruity and condignity, and ANNULLETH
" THEIR VAIN DISTINCTION OF A FIRST AND
" SECOND JUSTIFICATION; and, in plain terms, he
" ascribes our Justification to faith only in Christ.

" But leaving this, I wish *disputing* about good works were
" turned into *doing:* We have all learned in this age to put
" good works out of the chair of *merit* [L]; and justly, for
" none should sit in that chair but Christ Jesus; but we have
" not all learned to give them their due place in the matter of
" salvation; though they be not, as I said, *meriting causes*,
" yet are they *witnesses* of thy faith; thou art not now justified
" by them, yet shalt thou be judged by them, and tried
" whether thou wert justified in Christ Jesus or not. O,
" that our fruitless professors would consider this?" Thus far Bishop Cowper, in his Sermon preached at the Installation of the Abp. of St. Andrews.

Having, as I hope, fully confuted the ideal opinion of a first and second Justification, what shall I say to your assertions in favor of a third? I say of a *third?* for if your words have any meaning at all, you have not only attempted to make out three Justifications, but have affirmed at least a possibility of threescore; yea, even of threescore thousand; for you say (p. 6),

---

[L] I wish all had learned to do so in this age also.

" That

" That a man is juſtified by faith at his converſion, and when " his backſlidings are healed. But he is juſtified by works." ——" 1ſt. In the hour of trial, as Abraham when he offered " up Iſaac."——" 2dly. In a court of ſpiritual or civil judi- " cature, as St. Paul at the bar of Feſtus."——" 3dly. Before " the judgment-ſeat of Chriſt, as every one will be whoſe faith " when he goes hence is found working by love." Now beſides this threefold Juſtification; you have mentioned a former Juſtification by faith at a man's converſion, as alſo a freſh Juſtification every time his backſlidings are healed.

I will not ſtop to make any remarks on theſe ſtrange aſſertions; but muſt proceed to expreſs my aſtoniſhment at your bold declaration, that " the doctrine (of a ſecond Juſtifica- " tion by works) is ſo obvious in the Scriptures, ſo generally " received in all the churches of Chriſt, and ſo deeply en- " graven on the conſciences of ſincere profeſſors, that the moſt " eminent Chriſtians perpetually allude to it." In proof of what you allege, you moſt ungenerouſly bring the teſtimony of the late Mr. Whitefield, as well as of all the old Puritan divines; though if that venerable man Mr. Whitefield had been now living, and if his heart-felt grief and floods of tears, on account of the Minutes and the Vindications of them, would have ſuffered him to expreſs his ſentiments, I doubt not but he would have told you, that if need ſhould be, he was ready to offer himſelf among the foremoſt of *thoſe true Proteſtants*, whom you tell us (but alas! with an unfeeling ſneer at their ſuppoſed rejection) *could have burned againſt* the doctrine of a ſecond Juſtification by works. And as to the Puritan divines, there is not one of the many hundreds of them, from the beginning of queen Elizabeth's time, till the act of toleration under king William, but what abhorred the doctrine of a ſecond Juſtification by works, as full of rottenneſs and deadly poiſon; neither is the leaſt trace of it to be found in any of the confeſſions of faith among the reformed churches of Chriſt, either at home or abroad. As to the quotation you have brought from Mr. Henry in defence of this doctrine (though you always attempt to ſeize him in an unguarded hour) for any good it does your cauſe, it might as well have been urged in defence of *extreme unction*.

Surely then it is not without juſtice, that I accuſe you of the groſſeſt perverſions and miſrepreſentations that perhaps ever proceeded from any author's pen. The aſhes of that laborious man of God, Mr. Whitefield, you have raked up in order to bring him in as a coadjutor to ſupport your tottering fabric of a ſecond Juſtification by works; though the following abſtracts

from his Sermons will evidence how cordially he abhorred that Chriſt-degrading ſcheme.

" The Righteouſneſs of Jeſus Chriſt, my brethren, muſt " be imputed to you, or you never can have ANY intereſt in " him; your own works are but as *filthy rags*, for *you are* " *juſtified before God, without any reſpect to your works* PAST, " PRESENT, OR TO COME." 1ſt Sermon on Eccleſ. vii. 16. intitled, *The Folly and Danger of being not righteous enough.*

Again. " Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, or that which Chriſt has " done in our ſtead without us, is the *ſole* cauſe of our accep- " tance in the ſight of God, and of all holineſs wrought in us. " To this, and not to *the light within*, ſhould poor ſinners ſeek " for Juſtification in the ſight of God. For the ſake of Chriſt's " Righteouſneſs alone, and *not any thing wrought in us*, does " God look favorably upon us. Our ſanctification at beſt in " this life is not complete; though we are delivered from the " *power*, we are not freed from the *in-being* of ſin. But not " only the *dominion*, but the *in-being* of ſin, is forbidden by " the perfect law of God: For it is not ſaid, thou ſhalt not " *give way* to luſt, but *thou ſhalt not luſt*; ſo that whilſt the " principle of luſt remains in the leaſt degree in our hearts, " though we are otherwiſe never ſo holy, yet we cannot, on " account of that, hope for acceptance with God. We muſt " firſt therefore look for a Righteouſneſs, even the Righteouſ- " neſs of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. AND WHOSOEVER " TEACHETH ANY OTHER DOCTRINE, DOTH " NOT PREACH THE TRUTH AS IT IS IN JESUS." Serm. on 1 Cor. i. 30.

Let me add, that Mr. Whitefield's Sermon upon *the Lord our Righteouſneſs*, is from the beginning to the end levelled againſt the doctrine of a ſecond Juſtification by works; though he all along inſiſts upon good works as being the *declarative evidences* of our one, complete, free Juſtification by faith alone in Chriſt. Speaking expreſsly of the proceedings at the great day, as recorded Mat. xxv. and of thoſe to whom thoſe joyful words, *Come ye bleſſed*, &c. are addreſſed, he repreſents them as filled with an holy ſhame on thinking what unprofitable ſervants they had been, and how far they fell ſhort of what was their duty to have done. " Senſible of this (ſaith Mr. White- " field) they were ſo far from depending on their works for " Juſtification in the ſight of God, that they were filled as it " were with an holy bluſhing to think our Lord ſhould con- " deſcend to mention, much more to reward them, for their " poor works of faith and labours of love. I am perſuaded,

" their

" their hearts would riſe with an holy indignation againſt thoſe " who urge this paſſage as an objection againſt the aſſertion " of the Prophet in the words of the text, that *the Lord is our* " *Righteouſneſs*."

Again, mentioning the effects which this doctrine, rightly received, will produce in the hearts of believers, he thus goes on:

" I appeal to the experience of the preſent, as well as paſt " ages, if iniquity did and does not abound where the doctrine " of Chriſt's whole perſonal Righteouſneſs is moſt cried down, " and moſt ſeldom mentioned. *Arminian* being *Antichriſtian* " principles, always did, and always will, lead to *Antichriſtian* " practices; and never was there a reformation brought about " in the church, but by the preaching the doctrine of an im- " puted Righteouſneſs. This, as that man of God Luther " calls it, is *Articulus ſtantis, aut cadentis eccleſiæ, the article* " *by which the church ſtands or falls.* And though the preachers " of this doctrine are generally branded by thoſe on the other " ſide with the opprobrious names of Antinomians[K], deceivers, " and what not, yet I believe, if the truth of the doctrine on " both ſides was to be judged of by the lives of the preachers " and profeſſors of it, theirs on our ſide the queſtion would " have the advantage every way."

In the ſame Sermon, ſhewing from what ſource the denial of our one perfect Juſtification by the perſonal imputed Righteouſneſs of Chriſt ſprings, he ſays, " We are all *Arminians* and " *Papiſts* by nature, as one obſerves, *Arminianiſm is the back* " *way to Popery.*" And here I venture to affirm, that if we " deny the doctrine of an imputed Righteouſneſs, whatever " we may ſtile ourſelves, we are really *Papiſts in our hearts*, " and deſerve no other title from men."

But now for your proof that Mr. Whitefield was a maintainer of a ſecond Juſtification by works. " He has often ſaid " to his immenſe congregations, You are warned; I am clear " of your blood; I ſhall riſe as a ſwift witneſs againſt you, or " you againſt me, in the terrible day of the Lord: O remem- " ber to clear me then."

Now is it poſſible that you can infer from theſe expreſſions, (ſuppoſing them to be *verbatim* as you ſay) that Mr. Whitefield held the doctrine of a ſecond Juſtification by works? Surely all that can be gathered from them, is that Mr. Whitefield believed there would be a great and awful day in which all who ſit under the ſound of the goſpel, ſhall be called to give a ſolemn account of what they hear, and every miniſter who preaches as ſolemn an account of the doctrine delivered by him.

[K] Mr. F—r's Second Check gives full proof of this aſſertion.

But what ſhall I ſay to your putting an objection into Mr. Shirley's mouth againſt his dearly-beloved friend Mr. Whitefield, which I am ſure Mr. Shirley would not have uſed upon any account. Yet the more to engage your readers to believe that the words were really Mr. Shirley's, you mark them with commas, as is uſual in quotations. "Say not, Sir (ſay you) that "Such expreſſions were only *flights of oratory*, and prove "nothing;" if you do, *you touch the apple of God's eye.* Mr. "Whitefield was not a flighty orator, but ſpoke the words of "ſoberneſs and truth, &c. &c." And do you ever remember, Sir, that Mr. Shirley *did* call Mr. Whitefield *a flighty orator?* Did he ever intimate any ſuch thing, either in writing or in converſation? If not, where was your authority for ſo injurious a ſuppoſition? "Say not, *theſe were only flights of oratory, and* "*prove nothing.*" What is this more or leſs than, "Let not Mr. "Shirley ſay that Mr. Whitefield was a poor flighty enthuſiaſt, "who neither meant nor knew what he affirmed. I undertake "to vindicate his character againſt any ſuch foul aſperſions which "Mr. Shirley may raiſe, and therefore declare *that he was not* "*a flighty orator, but ſpoke the words of ſoberneſs and truth,*" &c. &c. But permit me to ſay, that however you may think to maintain your cauſe by artful inſinuations, as if you were defending Mr. Whitefield's principles, your defence comes with the ſame impropriety as an eloge would come from his Holineſs upon Martin Luther and John Calvin; for it is certain that the doctrine held by the Pope is not more diſtant from theſe reformers, than that of the late Mr. Whitefield from the doctrine of the Minutes, or of their Vindicator. If therefore, as you affirm, "Mr. Whitefield really *ſpoke the words of ſoberneſs* "*and truth,*" then what have Mr. Weſley and the Vindicator ſpoken? Two oppoſites can never both of them be truth; and if you believe what you ſay to Mr. Shirley, that Mr. Whitefield really delivered *to his immenſe congregations the truth as it is in Jeſus*, is not this at leaſt a tacit, though an undeſigned acknowledgment that certain other perſons do *not* preach the truth as it is in Jeſus?

Among the Puritan divines preſſed into your ſervice, John Bunyan is more than once mentioned by name, though I declare I cannot find the ſmalleſt traces of your ſyſtem in any of his works, except where he is deſcribing the faith of one *Mr. Ignorance*, in his Pilgrim's Progreſs. Here indeed I confeſs that the very doctrine of the Minutes and of both the Vindications is moſt viſible, unleſs it ſhould be thought that the creed of Mr. *Ignorance* is the more evangelical of the two. But to the proof.

Ignorance being aſked by *Chriſtian* concerning the way of acceptance

ceptance with God, very readily replies, "I muſt believe in "Chriſt for Juſtification." But when the nature of his faith comes to be enquired into, then the analogy between his name and his creed very plainly appears; for after *Chriſtian* hath endeavored to convince him that he was upon a falſe foundation, becauſe (like Mr. Baxter and Mr. Weſley) he never ſaw the neceſſity of Chriſt's perſonal Righteouſneſs to juſtify him before God, he anſwers, "I believe well enough for all that; for I "believe that Chriſt died for ſinners, and that I ſhall be juſti-"fied before God from the curſe, *through* his gracious accep-"tance of *my obedience* to his law; or thus, Chriſt makes my "duties that are religious acceptable to his Father by virtue of "his merits, and ſo ſhall I be juſtified."

In this anſwer of young *Ignorance* we have the very quinteſſence, not only of the Minutes, but of all Mr. Weſley's writings, except when he *leans too much towards Calviniſm* [M]. The grand fundamental error which Bunyan drives at in the confeſſion

---

[M] Mr. Weſley, in his Preſervative againg Unſettled Notions in Religion, p. 183, ſays, "Our obedience to Chriſt is THE CAUSE "of his becoming the author of eternal ſalvation to us."—Again, "Our obeying Chriſt is THE CAUSE of his giving us eternal "life." *Ibid.*—Again, "The breaſt plate of righteouſneſs is the "righteouſneſs of a ſpotleſs purity, in which Chriſt will preſent us "faultleſs, through the merit of his own blood." *Note on Eph.* vi. 14. Sometimes he makes the act of faith itſelf our evangelical righteouſneſs, whereby we are accepted; and this notion he has alſo adopted by his publication of Mr. Baxter's Aphoriſms, and of John Goodwin's (the furious Arminian regicide's) book, which aſſerts that faith, or the act of believing, is our goſpel righteouſneſs, and not the perſonal perfect Righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed. However, in his letters to Mr. Hervey he acknowledges, that "the foundation is "already laid in the merits of Chriſt; yet we obey (ſays he) IN "ORDER to our final acceptance through his merits." I ſhall make no obſervations of my own on this ungoſpelized ſyſtem, but beg leave to tranſcribe the words of Mr. Hervey, in his anſwer to Mr. Weſley upon the point in hand.

"What a coalition is here, between Mr. Weſley and the ſubjects "of the triple crown! I find the whole council of Trent eſtabliſh-"ing his ſentiments by their anathematizing decree. Theſe are their "words: "If any one ſhall ſay that the righteous ought not, for "their own good works, to expect the eternal reward, through the "merit of Jeſus Chriſt, let him be accurſed." Do you ſpeak of the "merit of Chriſt? So do they. Do you in ſome ſenſe allow Chriſt "to be the foundation? So do they. Are your works to rear the "edifice, and perform the moſt reſpectable part of the buſineſs? So "are theirs." Mr. Hervey's Letters to Mr. Weſley, p. 56.

of

of Ignorance, is his denial of Juſtification through the perſonal imputed Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, and therefore he puts the following anſwer into the mouth of his Pilgrim.

" Thy faith *(Ignorance)* is deceitful, even ſuch as will leave " thee under wrath in the day of God Almighty; for true " juſtifying faith puts the ſoul (as ſenſible of its loſt condition " by the law) upon flying for refuge unto Chriſt's Righteouſ- " neſs; (which Righteouſneſs of his is not an act of grace, by " which he maketh for Juſtification thy obedience accepted with " God, but his perſonal obedience to the law, in doing and " ſuffering for us what that required at our hands) this Righte- " ouſneſs, I ſay, true faith accepteth; under the ſkirt of which " the ſoul being ſhrouded, and by it preſented as ſpotleſs be- " fore God, it is accepted, and acquitted from condemnation."

To *Chriſtian's* reply *Ignorance* thus objects.

Ignorance. " What! would you have us truſt to what Chriſt " in his own perſon hath done without us? this conceit would " looſen the reins of our luſt, and tolerate us to live as we liſt; " for what matter how we live, if we may be juſtified by " Chriſt's perſonal Righteouſneſs, from all, when we believe " it [N]."

Chriſtian. " *Ignorance* is thy name; and as thy name is, " ſo art thou; even this thy anſwer demonſtrateth what I ſay, " *Ignorant* thou art of what *juſtifying righteouſneſs* is, and as " *ignorant* how to *ſecure* thy ſoul through the faith of it from " the heavy wrath of God. Yea, thou alſo art *ignorant* of " the true *effects* of ſaving faith in this Righteouſneſs of Chriſt,

---

[N] How, to the moſt minute tittle, does Mr. Weſley agree with *Ignorance* in this point? Hear his own words. " Doth not this " way of ſpeaking naturally tend to make Chriſt the miniſter of " ſin? for if the very *perſonal* obedience of Chriſt be mine, the mo- " ment I believe, can any thing be added thereto? Does my obey- " ing God add any value to the perfect obedience of Chriſt? On " this ſcheme, then, are not the holy and unholy on the very ſame " footing?" *Mr. Weſley's Thoughts on Imputed Righteouſneſs.*

In like manner Socinus himſelf, ſpeaking of the doctrine of Juſtification through the imputed Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, calls it, " *A* " *filthy, curſed, pernicious, deteſtable doctrine.*" Upon which Mr. Jenks obſerves, " That the man was ſo full of bitterneſs and ven- " geance againſt the only way of his ſalvation, that he knew not " what to ſay bad enough of it." Jenks's Submiſſion to the Righteouſneſs of God, p. 75, 4th edit.

So alſo the council of Trent: " If any man ſhall ſay that we are " (formally) righteous by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, let him be " accurſed." See Mr. Hervey's Letters to Mr. Weſley, p. 106.

" which

" which is to bow and win over the heart to God in Chriſt, " to love his name, his word, ways, and people, and not as " thou *ignorantly* imagineſt."

And now, Sir, I muſt inform you, that Mr. John Weſley has publiſhed ſeveral editions of an Abridgment of the Pilgrim's Progreſs, in which he has had the great diſingenuity not only to leave out the principal part of the converſation between *Ignorance* and *Chriſtian*, concerning Juſtification through the perſonal imputed Righteouſneſs of Chriſt; but abſolutely to alter Bunyan's words for ſeveral lines together, and thereby to make both *Ignorance* and *Chriſtian* ſpeak quite another language from what the evangelical author of the piece puts into their mouths. Mr. Weſley's reaſon for this is clear. He did not chooſe to have his followers ſee the exact harmony between his own faith and that of *Ignorance*; but I am ſorry that the purchaſers of the book ſhould be ſo impoſed upon as to have that palmed upon them for the Pilgrim's Progreſs which in reality is no ſuch thing; and therefore hope they will compare the true Bunyan with the falſe one.

Upon the whole, Sir, I think you would have acted more prudently in not endeavoring to impoſe upon your unwary readers, by bringing up the names of Mr. *Whitefield* and good old *Bunyan* as abettors of your errors; ſince this manner of acting has at once confirmed the charge of perverſion which I have brought againſt you, and laid me under the abſolute neceſſity of expoſing to view, the exact harmony between the creed of young *Ignorance* and old *Mordecai* [O]. And indeed I ſhould as ſoon have expected that the petitioners againſt the 39 articles and liturgy would have quoted the Athanaſian creed in ſupport of *Arianiſm*, as that my friend Mr. F——r would have fled to *John Bunyan*, Mr. *Whitefield*, and to the old Calviniſt divines, for weapons to defend a ſecond Juſtification by works, free-will, or ſinleſs perfection.

I muſt now beg leave to give your firſt letter another review, in order to inſert ſome particulars, which, without interrupting my plan, could not be attended to before.

[I.]

You give us to underſtand (p. 2), " There is but one ſtep " between the denial of a ſecond Juſtification by works, and the " very center of Antinomianiſm; and that if the preachers who " ſigned the declaration at the laſt conference had then tamely

[O] The name given to Mr. Weſley by Mr. F——r, in his Vindication.

" renounced

" renounced (what appears to you) a truth of ſo much impor-
" tance as the doctrine of a ſecond Juſtification, you yourſelf,
" without waiting for another conference, would have borne
" (what you call with a ſneer) your legal teſtimony againſt their
" Antinomian error. Nay, you declare that though you re-
" verence Mr. Weſley as the greateſt miniſter you know, yet
" you would plainly withſtand him to the face, were he really
" guilty of rejecting the doctrine of a ſecond Juſtification."
This is the ſubſtance of your paragraph:

As to any danger you may be in of withſtanding Mr. Weſley, I fancy, Sir, you may be pretty eaſy on that ſcore, as he ſeems well contented that you ſhould ſettle his creed; and if you can but accompliſh this, you will do in the ſpace of a few months what neither he himſelf, nor any other perſon, has been able to effect in the long period of near forty years; for, what between his *leaning* ſometimes *too much towards* CALVINISM, at others *too much towards* PELAGIANISM and ARMINIANISM, ſometimes *too much towards* POPERY, at others, by his own confeſſion, *too much towards* MYSTICISM and MORAVIANISM, ſometimes *too much towards* SINLESS PERFECTION, at others too much towards the contrary opinion; I ſay, on account of this fluctuating ocean on which the reverend author of the *Preſervative againſt Unſettled Notions in Religion* has been toſſed for ſo many years together, I have collected the annexed heterogeneous *Farrago* out of his own works, which he wrote at various times, and under various *leanings* to his various *iſms*, particularly when he drew lots whether or no he ſhould *preach and print* againſt the doctrine of election [P].

Be this as it will; whoever denies the doctrine of a ſecond Juſtification by works, is in Mr. F——r's account a rank Antinomian; but then he has the comfort of being one in the beſt of company; in that of the Apoſtles and Prophets, and even of Jeſus Chriſt himſelf, all the good old biſhops of the church of England, all the Proteſtant churches and Puritan divines, with that laborious man of God George Whitefield, and the honeſt author of the *Pilgrim's Progreſs*; all of whom I have fully proved bear their united teſtimonies againſt the *Minutes* and the *Vindicator*, who on his part has the happineſs of holding what he calls the evangelical doctrine of a ſecond Juſtification; 1ſt. With his *Holineſs*, or the *man of ſin*; 2dly. with Cardinal *Bellarmine*; 3dly. with the Jeſuits who put out the Rhemiſh

---

[P] See Mr. Whitefield's letter to Mr. Weſley, dated Bethesda in Georgia, Dec. 24, 1740.

Teſta-

Teſtament; 4thly. with Biſhop Hoadly; 5thly. with Mr. *Thomas Oliver*; and laſtly, with almoſt all the *careleſs* and *unawakened clergy* in the nation.

[II.]

You aſk (p. 9), "Who, but Dr. Criſp, could affirm, that "in the day of judgment, if I am accuſed of being actually an "hypocrite, Chriſt's ſincerity will juſtify me?"

Again. "Suppoſe I am charged with being a drunkard, a "thief, a whoremonger, a covetous perſon, a fretful, im- "patient, ill-natured man, or, if you pleaſe, *a proud bigot, an* "*implacable zealot, a malicious perſecutor, who notwithſtanding* "*fair appearances of godlineſs, would raiſe diſturbances even in* "*Heaven itſelf if I were admitted there*; will Chriſt's ſobriety, "honeſty, chaſtity, generoſity, or will his gentleneſs, pa- "tience, and meekneſs juſtify me from ſuch dreadful charges?" &c. &c.

Though no one be here mentioned by name except Dr. Criſp, yet I ſhrewdly ſuſpect that under theſe general queries ſome more *particular* intimations are couched, eſpecially where I have marked the words in Italics. But although you have been pleaſed to ſtart theſe objections by way of ſcarecrows to the unwary, I really cannot think that you believe in your heart, there are any ſuch perſons as hold the tenets above-mentioned. I am perſuaded you do not think this the caſe with dear Mr. Shirley, though you addreſs him ſo perſonally on this head; and that even the grand object of your acrimonious ſneer (THE HONEST DOCTOR) was utterly untainted with any ſuch leaven, let his own words declare. Speaking on the article of juſtification, he ſays, "It is faith alone juſtifies; works "have no hand in that buſineſs: yet that faith that juſtifies "alone, ſtands not alone without works, as if there could be "faith in men without a renovation of life. Now ſuch as "wreſt the ſcriptures to their own perdition, dream of a faith "that hath no fruits at all; St. James calls it vain and dead, "certainly true faith will make a man deny himſelf for Chriſt."

Dr. Criſp's Sermon on Self-Denial.

But permit me now, Sir, in return, to put the following queſtions to you.

If I myſelf be found a ſlanderer of God's people and miniſters; if I ſcruple not to deſcend to the meaneſt quibbles, that I may ſupport a favourite friend or opinion; if I can contend for doctrines, yea even for that of ſinleſs perfection, with a bitter, railing, acrimonious, ſarcaſtic ſpirit; and perhaps in the next breath, talk of *reverencing* and *lying in the duſt at the feet* of

 thoſe

thoſe I villify; will Chriſt's veracity, gentleneſs, charity and forbearance juſtify me? Have I not cauſe to fear that in my furious zeal to attack thoſe whom I may *falſely* ſtigmatize for Antinomians, my own *real* Antinomian tempers, uninfluenced by the law of love, ſhall riſe againſt me in the great day, when I myſelf ſhall be made to tremble at that text which I have ſo often brandiſhed in defence of a ſecond Juſtification; "*By thy words thou ſhalt be juſtified, and by thy words thou* "*ſhalt be condemned?*"

[III.]

I obſerve that you are very fond of bringing up that expreſſion, "I have nothing to do with the law," as if it were generally received as a truth among all the aſſertors of free grace, that, becauſe they are indeed *dead to the law*, and have nothing to do with it as a *covenant of works*, they may therefore live lawleſs and diſobedient, and are "not *under the law to Chriſt.*" But in this alſo, to adopt the apoſtle's manner of ſpeech againſt the objectors of your ſtamp in his day, *we are ſlanderouſly reported of.* And *Dr. Criſp* himſelf ſhall be produced, to confute what you have diſingenuouſly advanced. The Doctor in his ſermon on the uſe of the law, vol. II. p. 590, thus expreſſeth himſelf. "In reſpect of the rules of righte-"ouſneſs, or the matter of obedience, *we are under the* "*law ſtill*, or elſe we are lawleſs, to live every man as "ſeems good in his own eyes, which I know no *true Chriſ-*"*tain* dares ſo much as *think*; for Chriſt hath given no new "law diverſe from this, to order our converſation by; be-"ſides, we are under the law to know what is tranſgreſſion, "and what is the deſert of it." But although Doctor Criſp, and the preachers of free grace, be totally free from any ſuch deluſions and dangerous principles, yet there are ſome in the religious world that do, in the fulleſt ſenſe of the word, cry out, "We have nothing to do with the law;" as appears from the teſtimony of the author of the queries to thoſe who profeſs ſinleſs perfection. This gentleman poſitively affirms, that he has more than once heard the Perfectioniſts uſe this very expreſſion when preſſed by the nature and extent of the law; and to ſupport what they have ſaid, they have quoted that much-abuſed text, *We are not under the law, but under grace.*

The queriſt then aſks Mr. Weſley, "Whether it is not rank Antinomianiſm to call *ſins infirmities?*" Mr. Weſley anſwers, "*It is little better.*" [Pray, reader, remember this when you come to my third letter; there you will find by this

this anſwer of Mr. Weſley, that he includes himſelf, and the Vindicator, in the number of the rankeſt Antinomians]. Again, what does Mr. Weſley mean by *the repeal of the Adamic law?* Was not the law given to Adam in innocence; the ſame moral law which was given to Moſes upon Mount Sinai? If therefore the Adamic law be repealed, the moral law is of neceſſity repealed alſo. And thus we may ſee who it is has opened the way for that dangerous aſſertion, "We have no-"thing to do with the law."

Again, What are the principles deducible from that expreſſion of yours (p. 69), concerning *breaking the law in the moſt trifling points*, and your intimation, that it is accuſing God of *partiality* to ſuppoſe, that for ſuch breaches the ſoul comes under the curſe, when eternal truth hath declared, that *the wages of ſin* (of every ſin, even in thought) *is death*; and that *curſed is every one who continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them*; and that *not one jot or tittle of the law ſhall paſs away till all be fulfilled*; and that *he that keepeth the whole law, and yet offendeth in ONE POINT, is guilty of all?* Is not this, to ſay the leaſt, a moſt unguarded manner of ſpeaking? Does it not evidently tend to weaken the authority of the law, and of the law-giver himſelf? How can that be called a *trifling* matter, which hath doomed millions to everlaſting perdition, and which, if the blood of Chriſt did not interpoſe, would deſtroy every believer whatſoever? O, Sir, you may think as you pleaſe of Doctor Criſp, but I am certain you can find no ſuch licentious poſition as this in all his works. A *trifling tranſgreſſion of the law!* Sure I am (to uſe Mr. Weſley's exclamation to Mr. Hervey) that this is Antinomianiſm without a maſk. O ſyren ſong! O pleaſing ſound to every decent Formaliſt and ſelf-righteous Phariſee, who can thank God he is not as other men are, but has only *broken the law in the moſt trifling points*, perhaps by *ſins of ſurpriſe* [Q], and the *innocent infirmities incident to fleſh and blood* [R]. But bad, yea ſhocking as this expreſſion is, I have the charity to believe you did not mean thereby to give handle to the lawleſs and diſobedient. Let me intreat you, therefore, to ſhew the ſame charity to others; and may the following words of the great Biſhop Reynolds be graven on both our hearts! "When the

[Q] See Mr. Weſley's Sermons, vol I. p. 152, where he ſays, we cannot ſay either that men are or that they are not condemned for ſins of ſurprize in general.

[R] Mr. F——r's Vindication, p. 12.

thoſe I villify; will Chriſt's veracity, gentleneſs, charity and forbearance juſtify me? Have I not cauſe to fear that in my furious zeal to attack thoſe whom I may *falſely* ſtigmatize for Antinomians, my own *real* Antinomian tempers, uninfluenced by the law of love, ſhall riſe againſt me in the great day, when I myſelf ſhall be made to tremble at that text which I have ſo often brandiſhed in defence of a ſecond Juſtification; "*By thy words thou ſhalt be juſtified, and by thy words thou "ſhalt be condemned?*"

[III.]

I obſerve that you are very fond of bringing up that expreſſion, "I have nothing to do with the law," as if it were generally received as a truth among all the aſſertors of free grace, that, becauſe they are indeed *dead to the law*, and have nothing to do with it as a *covenant of works*, they may therefore live lawleſs and diſobedient, and are "not *under the law to Chriſt.*" But in this alſo, to adopt the apoſtle's manner of ſpeech againſt the objectors of your ſtamp in his day, *we are ſlanderouſly reported of.* And *Dr. Criſp* himſelf ſhall be produced, to confute what you have diſingenuouſly advanced. The Doctor in his ſermon on the uſe of the law, vol. II. p. 590, thus expreſſeth himſelf. "In reſpect of the rules of righte-"ouſneſs, or the matter of obedience, *we are under the* "*law ſtill*, or elſe we are lawleſs, to live every man as "ſeems good in his own eyes, which I know no *true Chriſ-"tain* dares ſo much as *think*; for Chriſt hath given no new "law diverſe from this, to order our converſation by; be-"ſides, we are under the law to know what is tranſgreſſion, "and what is the deſert of it." But although Doctor Criſp, and the preachers of free grace, be totally free from any ſuch deluſions and dangerous principles, yet there are ſome in the religious world that do, in the fulleſt ſenſe of the word, cry out, "We have nothing to do with the law;" as appears from the teſtimony of the author of the queries to thoſe who profeſs ſinleſs perfection. This gentleman poſitively affirms, that he has more than once heard the Perfectioniſts uſe this very expreſſion when preſſed by the nature and extent of the law; and to ſupport what they have ſaid, they have quoted that much-abuſed text, *We are not under the law, but under grace.*

The queriſt then aſks Mr. Weſley, "Whether it is not rank Antinomianiſm to call *ſins infirmities?*" Mr. Weſley anſwers, "*It is little better.*" [Pray, reader, remember this when you come to my third letter; there you will find by this

this anſwer of Mr. Weſley, that he includes himſelf, and the Vindicator, in the number of the rankeſt Antinomians]. Again, what does Mr. Weſley mean by *the repeal of the Adamic law?* Was not the law given to Adam in innocence; the ſame moral law which was given to Moſes upon Mount Sinai? If therefore the Adamic law be repealed, the moral law is of neceſſity repealed alſo. And thus we may ſee who it is has opened the way for that dangerous aſſertion, "We have no-"thing to do with the law."

Again, What are the principles deducible from that expreſſion of yours (p. 69), concerning *breaking the law in the moſt trifling points*, and your intimation, that it is accuſing God of *partiality* to ſuppoſe, that for ſuch breaches the ſoul comes under the curſe, when eternal truth hath declared, that *the wages of ſin* (of every ſin, even in thought) *is death*; and that *curſed is every one who continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them*; and that *not one jot or tittle of the law ſhall paſs away till all be fulfilled*; and that *he that keepeth the whole law, and yet offendeth in ONE POINT, is guilty of all?* Is not this, to ſay the leaſt, a moſt unguarded manner of ſpeaking? Does it not evidently tend to weaken the authority of the law, and of the law-giver himſelf? How can that be called a *trifling* matter, which hath doomed millions to everlaſting perdition, and which, if the blood of Chriſt did not interpoſe, would deſtroy every believer whatſoever? O, Sir, you may think as you pleaſe of Doctor Criſp, but I am certain you can find no ſuch licentious poſition as this in all his works. A *trifling tranſgreſſion of the law!* Sure I am (to uſe Mr. Weſley's exclamation to Mr. Hervey) that this is Antinomianiſm without a maſk. O ſyren ſong! O pleaſing ſound to every decent Formaliſt and ſelf-righteous Phariſee, who can thank God he is not as other men are, but has only *broken the law in the moſt trifling points*, perhaps by *ſins of ſurpriſe* [Q], and the *innocent infirmities incident to fleſh and blood* [R]. But bad, yea ſhocking as this expreſſion is, I have the charity to believe you did not mean thereby to give handle to the lawleſs and diſobedient. Let me intreat you, therefore, to ſhew the ſame charity to others; and may the following words of the great Biſhop Reynolds be graven on both our hearts! "When the

[Q] See Mr. Weſley's Sermons, vol I. p. 152, where he ſays, we cannot ſay either that men are or that they are not condemned for ſins of ſurprize in general.

[R] Mr. F——r's Vindication, p. 12.

" commandment comes it ſhews how the leaſt atom doth " ſpot the ſoul; the ſmalleſt omiſſion qualify for hell; make " the conſcience ſee thoſe infinite ſparkles and ſwarms of " luſt that riſe out of the heart; and that God is all eye to " ſee, and all fire to conſume ever unclean thing; that the " ſmalleſt ſins require the precious blood of Chriſt to expiate " and waſh them out."—Sermon on the Sinfulneſs of Sin, p. 50.

[IV.]

Under the old ſpecious pretence of ſtanding up for the intereſts of virtue and morality, you give us to underſtand, (p. 14), that " Every neglect of duty will rob us of a degree " of glory, and every wilful ſin will rob us of a jewel in our " crown, if not of our crown itſelf." I agree with you that we cannot expreſs ourſelves too ſtrongly againſt ſin, nor be watchful enough to prevent it: But let us take care that our zeal againſt this monſter flow in a right channel, and that under the notion of fighting *againſt* ſin, we be not found fighting againſt the only propitiation *for* ſin, and making it of none effect; for if every ſin, yea even every wilful ſin, *will rob a believer* (and of ſuch you here ſpeak) *of a jewel in his crown, if not of the crown itſelf*; then what benefit have we by the atonement, and what becomes of the following ſcriptures, as well as of a thouſand others of the like import? *The blood of Jeſus Chriſt cleanſeth us from* ALL *ſin.—If any man ſin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jeſus Chriſt the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our ſins.—Who ſhall lay* ANY THING *to the charge of God's elect?—He ever liveth to make interceſſion for us.—All manner of ſin and blaſphemy ſhall be forgiven unto men.*—If this be the caſe, " *That every neg-* " *lect of duty will rob us of a degree of glory, and every wilful* " *ſin of a jewel of our crown, if not of our crown itſelf*;" if, after all, a believer is to be reſponſible for his own offences, then what becomes of Chriſt's office as a mediator? Where is the excellency of his prieſthood? How hath *he redeemed us from the curſe of the law?* How under his type of the ſcape-goat, hath he *carried our ſins into the land of forgetfulneſs?* and how can he be ſaid to have *put away ſin by the ſacrifice of himſelf*, and to have BLOTTED OUT *as a cloud our ſins, and as a thick cloud our tranſgreſſions?* You will pardon me, Sir, if I ſay that this aſſertion of yours has an evident, though I hope, an undeſigned, tendency towards Socinianiſm; and that I am ſorry to find, that ſome

ſome who ſeem *dreadfully afraid of under-valuing themſelves*, take no ſmall pains to under-value the glorious everlaſting finiſhed ſalvation of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt [S]. But I conclude this point with the following extract from that glorious champion of the Reformation, (I am not aſhamed to mention him, though you may deem him a worſe Antinomian than Dr. Criſp) the bleſſed *Martin Luther*. "This acceptation, or "*imputation*, is very neceſſary; firſt, becauſe we are *not* yet "*perfectly righteous*, but *while we remain in this life, ſin* "*dwelleth in our fleſh*; and this remnant of ſin God purgeth in "us. Moreover, we are ſometimes left of the Holy Ghoſt, "and fall into ſins, as did *Peter*, *David*, and other holy "men, notwithſtanding we have always recourſe to this "article, that our ſins are covered, and that God will not "lay them to our charge. (Pſal. xxxii. Rom. iv.) Not that "ſin is not in us, as the Papiſts [T] have taught, ſaying, We "muſt be always working well, until we feel there is no "guilt of ſin remaining in us; the godly do feel it, but it is "covered, and is *not imputed* to us of God for Chriſt's ſake; "whom becauſe we do apprehend by faith, all our ſins are "now no ſins. Wherefore if ſin vex thee, and death terrify "thee, think that it is, (as it is indeed) but an imagination, "and a falſe illuſion of the Devil; for in very deed there is "now no ſin, no curſe, no death, no devil to hurt us any more, "for Chriſt hath vanquiſhed and aboliſhed all theſe things."

LUTHER on the GALATIANS.

[S] Before Mr. Hervey knew the way of God more perfectly, he thought with the Vindicator, that our good works and duties were to be ſo many ſtuds or jewels in our crown; and that from *having the witneſs in ourſelves, that we have done what God commanded, we might* (without hereſy) *humbly demand the promiſed reward.* Vind. p. 77. While he was rocking himſelf in this cradle of ſelf-applauſe, he wrote the following lines to the memory of a generous benefactor, for which he tells us he "now willingly takes ſhame to himſelf, they being the very reverſe of that belief in which he hoped to perſevere as long as he had any being." The lines are theſe:

Our wants reliev'd by thy indulgent care,
Shall give thee courage at the dreadful bar,
And ſtud the crown thou ſhalt for ever wear.

Tenth Letter to Mr. Weſley, p. 230.

[T] Behold the ſink from which the doctrine of ſinleſs perfection is drained.

[V.]

You ſeem much diſpleaſed with that expreſſion, *the love of Chriſt conſtraineth us*; for you not only twice introduce it with a ſneer, but you object vehemently againſt the important truth which it conveys; and though it comes in St. Paul's own words, yet you tell us, (to uſe your own phraſe) *with an air of poſitiveneſs and aſſurance*, "that St. Paul thought the contrary;" (that is, he thought the love of Chriſt would *not* conſtrain, though he has abſolutely affirmed that it *would* conſtrain,) and then you bring ſome texts to prove, that the fear of puniſhment, and hopes of reward, ought to have at leaſt as much influence to excite us to holineſs as the love of Chriſt. Now, though I by no means deny that hopes and fears are collateral motives to obedience, yet I will declare upon the houſe-top, that where love is wanting, every work which ſprings from any other principle is unacceptable to God, and the doer of it no better than ſounding braſs, or a tinkling cymbal. So ſaith St. Paul, 1 Cor. xiii. [U]; ſo prays Mr. F——r in the collect for Quinquageſſima-ſunday [X]; and ſo ſings Mr. Weſley [Y].

[VI.]

You bring a quotation, (p. 46), which you ſay you give

[U] The word which we tranſlate *charity* throughout this chapter, is in the Greek αγαπη, *love*.

[X] O Lord, who haſt taught us, that all our doings without charity (or love) are nothing worth, ſend thy Holy Ghoſt, and pour into our hearts that moſt excellent gift of charity, the very bond of peace and of all virtues, without which, whoſoever liveth is counted dead before thee. Grant this for thine only ſon Jeſus Chriſt's ſake. Amen.

[Y] Love *alone* can match in fight,
And conquer every foe;
Saul, with all his ſtrength and might,
Can never ſin o'erthrow.

Hymns and Sacred Poems, vol. II. p. 175.

Again, 'Tis love that makes our chearful feet
In ſwift obedience move;
The devils know, and tremble too,
But Satan cannot love.

Knowledge, alas! 'tis all in vain,
And all in vain our fear;
Our ſtubborn ſins will fight and reign,
If love be abſent there.

us in " *the expreſs words of the MINUTES*;" and you have marked it in commas, to diſtinguiſh it as the very expreſſion of the Minutes themſelves: but upon examining the Minutes, (though I thought I recollected them well enough before) there is really no ſuch expreſſion to be found. The words as they ſtand in the Minutes are juſt theſe: " *Not by the merit* " *of works, but by works as a condition.*" You have expunged the latter clauſe, and added in the ſtead, " *By believ-* " *ing in Chriſt*;" and then from the ſentence taken altogether as you have given it, you tell Mr. Shirley, " *That the foun-* " *dation had only been ſhaken in his own ideas, and was per-* " *fectly ſecured by thoſe expreſs words of the Minutes*, (which " however are no where to be found in the Minutes) *not by* " *the merit of works, but by believing in Chriſt*;" the words being really as I ſaid before, " *Not by the merit of works,* " *but by works as a condition.*" [*Vide the Minutes themſelves*].

Forgeries of this kind have long paſſed for no crime with Mr. Weſley; witneſs the inſtances brought by Mr. Hervey in his eleven letters; and witneſs his late extract from Mr. Toplady's tranſlation of Zanchy. But notwithſtanding your aſſertion, that you look upon Mr. Weſley as the greateſt miniſter in the world, I really did not think you would have followed him in theſe ungenerous artifices, which, when once detected, muſt unavoidably ſink the writer in our eſteem.——But I am ſorry to ſay, Sir, that this is not the only ſtratagem of the ſort you have made uſe of: inſtance, your bringing Mr. Whitefield as a maintainer of a ſecond Juſtification by works; John Bunyan as an advocate for free will and ſinleſs perfection [V]; and affirming, both in the body of your book, as alſo in your poſtſcript, to the utter deception of all readers who doubt not of your veracity, and have not their works to refer to, that all the Puritan divines of the laſt century are on your ſide of the queſtion, and on the ſide of the Minutes.

[VII.]

I intended to have made ſeveral others extracts from your firſt letter; but as I really cannot find many lines together free from groſs miſrepreſentations and perverſions, and hardly one ſingle paragraph exempt from cutting ſneers and low ſarcaſms, I confeſs I have not patience to tranſcribe them; eſpecially when I conſider that they are addreſſed to one who, notwithſtanding your former unkind behaviour, hath treated

---

[V] This is pretty ſtrongly inſinuated, *Second Check*, p. 68.

you

you with all the politeneſs of a gentleman, and the humility of a Chriſtian. However, you tell us in a note, that you beg "You may not be underſtood to level any part of "your letters at your pious Calviniſt brethren; and that God "only knows how highly you reverence many who are im-"moveably fixed (in what ſome call) the doctrines of grace," &c. But having informed us at whom the keen expreſſions in your letters are *not* levelled, be pleaſed to inform us at whom they *are* levelled. Tell us plainly whoſe are thoſe *celebrated pulpits where more is ſaid at times for ſin than againſt it; and in which no practical texts of ſcripture can be handled without diſguſting the audience, unleſs ſuch texts are diſtorted and violated to make them grateful to the Antinomian palates of the hearers.* Point out, *by name*, thoſe miniſters *who often give their congregations particular accounts of the covenant between the perſons of the bleſſed Trinity, and who* (to uſe your own ſneering expreſſion) *ſpeak of it as confidently, as if the King of kings had admitted them members of his privy-council, though they ſeldom do juſtice to the ſcriptures where the covenant is mentioned in a practical manner.* Tell us who you mean by thoſe *free-grace orthodox preachers*, who have deluded their thouſands by ſinging *the ſyren ſong of finiſhed ſalvation*, thereby making their hearers afraid of the practice of good works, "*leſt they ſhould work out abominations,* "*inſtead of ſalvation.*"—If ſuch miniſters as theſe are now exiſting, and particularly if they have gotten poſſeſſion of our moſt *celebrated pulpits*, they ought to be expoſed, and publicly too: It is miſpriſion of treaſon againſt the Majeſty of Heaven and earth, not to caution the world againſt them. I *openly* object againſt Mr. Weſley's doctrine and yours without any equivocations or *ſly ſtabs under the fifth rib*;" and if you, in return, do not tell us who you mean by theſe celebrated Antinomian preachers, and prove the accuſations you have brought againſt them, the charges of calumny and perverſion muſt for ever lie at your door.

[VIII.]

I make a few obſervations on your ſecond note, and then conclude this letter.—Mr. Weſley's inconſiſtencies with himſelf having drawn upon him the obſervations of an anonymous writer, Mr. F——r undertakes to vindicate theſe inconſiſtencies, and to reconcile all Mr. Weſley's ſelf-contradictory tenets, as equally agreeable to the word of God. And how does our Vindicator attempt this? Why, by the example of a phyſician, whoſe ſkill is demonſtrated by adminiſter-

ing

ing to his patients, under their different diſorders, ſometimes hot, and ſometimes cooling medicines. Now, what an evaſive compariſon is here! So, becauſe the ſame phyſician may, with propriety, preſcribe different medicines to his patients, according to their various diſeaſes, *ergo*, truth may alter its nature, and a phyſician of the ſoul may ſometimes, with propriety, adminiſter falſhood or *damnable hereſies*:—but two direct oppoſites, as I obſerved before, can never be both of them true; for if the one be agreeable to wholeſome doctrine, the other muſt be rank poiſon; therefore, unleſs Mr. F——r can prove, that the ability of the phyſician may be conſiſtent with his ſometimes adminiſtering a plentiful doſe of hemlock or rats-bane, I fear that we cannot allow Mr. Weſley any other title than that of an empiric, or quack doctor. At leaſt, we muſt look upon him in the ſame inconſiſtent light, as the ſatyr in the fable looked upon the traveller, becauſe he blew hot and cold with the ſame mouth.

And now, pardon me, Sir, if in the courſe of this letter I have catched a few ſparks of your contagious ſatiric fire, or, to uſe your own expreſſion, a little of your MILD IRONY*; if I have, I truſt the diſtemper has ſpread no farther, and that I remain yet free from the charges of calumny and perverſion.

I am,

Reverend Sir,

Your moſt humble Servant.

The Author of P. O.

P. S. The following words of Mr. Weſley, with two or three queries, naturally reſulting therefrom, I add by way of Poſtſcript to this Epiſtle.

"In the afternoon I was informed, *how* many wiſe and "learned men (who cannot in terms *deny* it, becauſe our ar-"ticles and homilies are not yet repealed) explain Juſtifica-"tion by faith. They ſay, 1ſt. Juſtification is two-fold; "the firſt in this life; the ſecond, at the laſt day, &c. &c. In "flat oppoſition to this, I cannot but maintain, (at leaſt till I "have a clearer light) That the Juſtification which is ſpoken "of by St. Paul to the Romans, and in our articles, IS NOT "TWOFOLD. IT IS ONE, AND NO MORE."

Mr. Weſley's Journal, from Nov. 1739, *to Sept.* 1741.

* Third Check, note, p. 105.

The queries I would put from the perusal of the foregoing extract, are,

1st. If Mr. Wesley does not now believe in a twofold Justification, why does he give his imprimatur to Mr. F—r's book in defence of this doctrine?

2d. If he thinks the CLEARER LIGHT is come, and therefore does now believe in a twofold Justification, why does he yet reprint, and cause to be sold, his own Journals in denial of it?

However, that this CLEARER LIGHT is not yet come, we may safely conclude, from the following extract of a letter, written by Mr. Wesley, May 14, 1765, and reprinted in a new edition of his Journals, *ann.* 1768.

"I think on Justification just as I have done any time "these seven and twenty years; and just as Mr. Calvin "does. In this respect, I do not differ from him *an hair's* "*breadth.*"

Journal from Oct. 1762, to *May* 1765, p. 115.

3d. If the doctrine of a twofold Justification, the first in *this life*, the second at *the last day*, be, as Mr. Wesley affirms, contrary to St. Paul, and to the articles and homilies of our church, will Mr. Wesley say, that a minister who maintains this doctrine, is a false teacher, or a true one?

LETTER II.

REVEREND SIR,

YOUR ſecond letter is uſhered in with exclamations of ſorrow and ſurprize, that Mr. Shirley ſhould have *recanted his ſermons in the face of the whole world.* I have little to ſay on this head. Mr. Shirley, as being the author of them, had certainly a right to diſpoſe of them as he thought proper; and if he deemed them erroneous, and liable to take the readers off the true and only foundation, he acted the part of an honeſt man, and of a Chriſtian divine, to renounce them *in the face of the world*: but alas! a favourite tenet of Mr. Weſley's is given up in this recantation; that great Diana, FREE WILL, is renounced *in the face of the world.* Well! bleſſed be God that it is ſo: but Mr. F——r dares not ſay, Amen; on the contrary, he has defended the doctrine: But how? Why, with the very ſame weapons that the Jeſuits defended it againſt the Proteſtants at the time of the Reformation; the ſame that *Clarke, Hoadly, Sykes, Pope, Whitby,* Doctor P——y, Doctor N——l, and all the unawakened clergy of this day now make uſe of; weapons drawn out of the quiver of unenlightened reaſon, *after the rudiments of this world, and not after Chriſt.* For example: *By exploding free-will, you rob us of free-agency. You afford the wicked, who determine to continue in ſin, the beſt excuſe in the world to do it without either ſhame or remorſe. You make us mere machines, and indirectly reflect on the wiſdom of our Lord, for ſaying to a ſet of Jewiſh machines, I would, and ye would not. —You repreſent it as an unwiſe thing for God to judge the world in righteouſneſs.—A will forced is no more a will, it is mere compulſion; freedom is not leſs eſſential to it, than moral agency to man.*

Theſe are the arguments you make uſe of, and what follows is the concluſion you draw from them.

"I am ſorry, Sir, (ſay you) to diſſent from ſuch a *reſpectable* "*divine* as yourſelf; but as I have no taſte for new refinements, "and cannot even conceive how our actions can be morally

" good or evil, any further than our free will is concerned in " them, I muſt follow the univerſal experience of mankind, " and ſide with the author of the Sermons, againſt the author " of the Narrative, concerning the *freedom* of the will." But I cannot think you are very happy in the appeal you make to the *univerſal experience of mankind* in confirmation of *free will*. On the contrary, it appears to me that *the univerſal experience of mankind*, proves the natural freedom of the will to good, much in the ſame manner as the graves in every church-yard prove that nobody ever did die or ſhall die; or as the writings of Lord Bolingbroke and Mr. Hume, prove that Jeſus Chriſt was the true Meſſiah. But you exclaim, " If all that ſtrongly ſavors of *free will* muſt be burned, ye heavens what Smithfield work will there be in your lucid plains!" True, and to the bundles you have already bound up for the fire, I ſuppoſe may be added more than nine out of ten of the ſermons that are preached in this nation every ſabbath-day, and with them alſo the decrees of the council of Trent, which clearly ſide with you againſt the ſcriptures and our tenth article; for thus this council determines on the point in hand: " If any perſon ſhall ſay " that ſince the fall of Adam, man's *free will* is loſt and ex- " tinct, let him be accurſed." Seſſ. vi. can. 5.

You then proceed to anſwer Mr. Edwards's grand argument againſt free will, which you conſider *as a begging of the queſtion, if not an abſurdity*. For, " What is a balance (ſay you) but " lifeleſs matter? And what is the will but the living active " ſoul, ſpringing up in its willing capacity, and ſelf-exerting, " ſelf-determining power? O how tottering is the mighty fa- " bric, raiſed, I ſhall not ſay upon ſuch a fine-ſpun metaphyſical " ſpeculation, but upon ſo weak a foundation as a compariſon, " which ſuppoſes that two things ſo widely different as ſpirit " and matter, *a living ſoul* and a *lifeleſs balance*, are exactly " alike with the reference to ſelf-determination! JUST AS " IF SPIRIT, MADE AFTER THE IMAGE OF THE " LIVING, FREE, AND POWERFUL GOD, was no " more capable of determining itſelf, than an horizontal beam " ſupporting two equal copper bowls by ſix ſilken ſtrings."

Now it muſt be obvious to every reader, that this reaſoning, eſpecially that part of it which I have put in capitals, amounts to a direct denial of the corruption of human nature. Mr. Edwards very juſtly ſuppoſes, that the will of man can only chooſe or refuſe, as it is influenced by the underſtanding, which being in total darkneſs as to ſpiritual things by the fall, neceſſarily preſents all objects to the will through a falſe medium, ſo that the will cannot but embrace that which the underſtanding repreſents as excellent; and if the underſtanding be

really

really blinded through the original apoſtacy, (as none but the rankeſt Pelagian ever denied) then it can only repreſent *ſin* as the moſt deſirable object to the will; which accordingly follows ſin, and nothing but ſin, till the eyes of the underſtanding are enlightened, to ſee the monſter in its true and odious colours.

How forcibly does Mr. Weſley confirm this reaſoning, in his Chriſtian Library, vol. XLVII. p. 57, where he ſays, "I "wonder as much at the doctrine that ſome men have ad- "vanced concerning *free-will*, as that which others have "broached in favour of good works, &c. &c. &c.

"And *this my faith, is not grounded on a roving fancy*, but "on the moſt ſolid reaſons. Foraſmuch as of ourſelves we are "not able in our *underſtandings* to diſcern the evil from the "good, much leſs then, are we able in our *wills* to prefer the "good before the evil, the will never ſettling upon any thing "but what the judgment diſcovers to it."

Conſcious of the force of this truth, Mr. F——r is reduced to a confeſſion, which in the twinkling of an eye throws down all the puny free-will fabrick he has been building. His words are theſe.

"Nor is this freedom derogatory to free grace; for as it "was free grace that gave an upright free will to Adam at his "creation, ſo whenever his fallen children think or act aright, "it is becauſe their free will is mercifully prevented, touched, "and ſo far rectified by free grace."

Amazing! Here is all that the moſt rigid Calviniſt ever contended for granted in a moment. Your words, Sir, are purely evangelical. The free will which God gave to Adam in innocence is here plainly acknowledged, and the abſolute inability of any of his fallen children to act and think aright as poſitively aſſerted, till their wills are *mercifully prevented, touched and rectified by free grace*. All of which would be entirely needleſs, if man's will ſince the fall were naturally free to good.

The eight firſt lines of your next paragraph ſpoil all again; though the remaining part of it contains perhaps the moſt convincing forcible arguments in favor of the natural ſlavery of the will to evil that ever proceeded from any author's pen, as well as the moſt pregnant proofs of the power and ſovereignty of God in working upon and changing the corrupt will, and keeping it ever afterwards wonderfully and immoveably fixed upon himſelf, as the center of all happineſs. But I haſten to tranſcribe the paragraph.

"However, it muſt be granted that faſhionable profeſſors, "and the large book of Mr. Edwards, are in general for you; "but when you maintained the freedom of the will, Jeſus "Chriſt and the goſpel were on your ſide. To the end of

"the

" the world, this plain peremptory assertion of our Lord, *I* " *would and ye would not*, will alone throw down the sophisms, " and silence the objections of the most subtle philosophers " against free will."

Jesus Christ and the gospel on the side of free will! An astonishing assertion for a Protestant divine, who has set his hand to the tenth article of our church, and who professes to believe and to teach, " That the condition of man after the fall of " Adam is such that he cannot turn and prepare himself, by his " own natural strength and good works, to faith and calling " upon God: And that we have NO POWER to do good " works, pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace " of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good " will, and working with us when we have that good will." Art. x.

Jesus Christ and the gospel on the side of free will! What! when the Saviour himself declares in such positive terms, *Without me ye can do nothing. No man* CAN *come unto me except the Father draw him*; that *the Son quickeneth whom* HE WILL; *and that we have not chosen him, but he hath chosen us.* The gospel on the side of free will! What! when Paul affirms, that *it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth; that it is God that worketh in us both to will and to do, having predestinated us by Jesus Christ unto himself, according to the good pleasure of* HIS WILL; that *of ourselves we are without strength, and that* ALL *our sufficiency is of God, who* (as the Psalmist says) *makes his people willing in the day of his power*, and whose *strength is made perfect in their weakness.* The gospel on the side of free will! when the beloved Evangelist himself hath taught us (and our own experience confirmeth the witness), that the *heirs of promise* ARE NOT BORN OF THE WILL OF THE FLESH, *nor* OF THE WILL OF MAN, *but of God*; who (as St. James also saith) OF HIS OWN WILL *begat them with the word of truth.* Surely, Sir, after such an assertion as this, that Jesus Christ and the gospel are on the side of free will, I have full right to retort one of your own sneers against you, which I will attempt as nearly in your own language (p. 13) as the case will allow. " With " the seven-fold shield of their Pelagian and Arminian faith, " they would fight the twelve Apostles round, and come off, " in their own imagination, more than conquerors. Nay, " were Christ himself to come to them *incognito*, as he did to " the disciples that went to Emmaus, and say, *All that the* " *Father hath given me shall come unto me; ye have not chosen* " *me, but I have chosen you; no man can come unto me except the* " *Father draw him; the Son quickeneth whom he will; if it*

" *were*

" *were poſſible, they ſhall deceive the very elect*; it is well if, " while they meaſured him from head to foot, with looks of " pity or ſurprize, ſome would not be bold enough to ſay with " a ſneer, you are an Antinomian it ſeems; a follower of the " Criſpian goſpel, are you? For our parts, we will ſtick cloſe " to good Mr. John [Z], to Mr. Walter Sellon, and the " Vicar of Madeley; but you are for election and perſeverance, " for *bound-will*, and irreſiſtible grace."

Now, Sir, how do you feel your heart after reading all this unmeaning, but bitter, ſneer and banter. I think (unleſs you have really attained to ſinleſs perfection) that you find ſome ſmall riſings of old Adam, and that you condemn my way of arguing, as very much calculated to irritate, but not at all to enforce conviction. And if this be the caſe upon your reading a ſingle paragraph, retorted upon you *verbatim* in your own language, what muſt Mr. Shirley, what muſt every candid reader of your book think and feel, when they have laboured through more than an hundred cloſe pages in the very ſame ſneering ſpirit, and as totally void of ſolid ſcriptural argument as they are replete with calumny, groſs perverſions and equivocations?

Still it is your opinion, that to the end of the world this plain peremptory aſſertion of our Lord, *I would and ye would not*, will throw down and ſilence all the objections which can be raiſed againſt free will.

The text you have brought is indeed a ſtriking demonſtration of the ſtubbornneſs and averſion to good, which naturally reigns in the human will, and that it reſolutely ſtands out againſt all the threats and invitations which can be laid before it. But what more does it prove? You will perhaps ſay, " it proves that thoſe to whom it was addreſſed might have come if they would." Granted. Still we are but juſt where we were. The fault yet remains in the corruption of

---

[Z] Whoſoever reſolves to ſtick cloſe to Mr. John ought firſt to wiſh that Mr. John would ſtick a little cloſer to himſelf; becauſe, however Mr. F——r may think that Jeſus Chriſt and the goſpel are on the ſide of man's free will, Mr. Weſley is (at intervals) of a very different opinion; as his own words clearly evince. " Such is the " freedom of man's will! Free only to evil; free to drink iniquity like " water. To wander farther and farther from the living God, and " to do more deſpight to the ſpirit of grace." *Mr. Weſley's Serm. on Rom.* viii. 15. Spoken like a right orthodox free-grace preacher; a ſound pillar of the church of England!

the

the will, which nothing but efficacious grace can conquer; and therefore if you battle the argument a thouſand times over, all that you can ſay muſt at length end in the language of Paul's oppoſer, "Why doth he yet find fault, for who hath "reſiſted his will?" But I go to the latter part of the paragraph under conſideration.

"When (ſay you) I conſider what it implies, far from ſup-"poſing that the will is like a lifeleſs pair of ſcales, neceſſarily "turned by the leaſt weight, I ſee it ſuch a ſtrong *ſelf-deter-*"*mining* power, that it can reſiſt the effect of the moſt amaz-"ing weights; keep itſelf inflexible under all the warnings, "threatenings, miracles, promiſes, entreaties and tears of the "ſon of God; and remain obſtinately unmoved under all the "ſtrivings of his holy ſpirit. Yes, put in one ſcale the moſt "ſtupendous weights, for inſtance, the hopes of heavenly "joys, and the dread of helliſh torments; and only the gaudy "feather of honour, or the breaking bubble of worldly joy in "the other; if the will caſts itſelf into the light ſcale, the "feather or bubble will inſtantly preponderate. Nor is the "power of the rectified will leſs wonderful; for though you "ſhould put all the kingdoms of the world and their glory in "one ſcale, and nothing but the reproach of Chriſt in the "other; yet if the evil freely leaps into the infamous ſcale, a "crown of thorns eaſily outweighs a thouſand golden crowns, "and a devouring flame makes ten thouſand thrones kick the "beam."

In this one excellent paragraph you have again granted all that the moſt ſtaunch Calviniſt could wiſh; for you not only prove the abſolute dominion which ſin hath over the natural will, and that nothing but efficacious invincible grace can move it and make it flexible, but you likewiſe maintain the power of the rectified will, (i. e. as you explain yourſelf above, of the will *mercifully prevented, touched, and rectified by free grace*) to reſiſt crowns and ſceptres for the croſs and for the ſtake, and to *count the reproach of Chriſt greater riches than the treaſures of Egypt*. Whatever Mr. Weſley may be, I am ſure that Mr. F——r is not here afraid of *leaning too much towards Calviniſm*; ſince we have the very quinteſſence of that great reformer John Calvin's ſyſtem in theſe golden words of the Vindicator. Here man is abaſed indeed; his natural will proved to be what Luther calls it, a *very bond-ſlave to evil*; whilſt all the glory of *preventing*, *touching* and *rectifying* the will is given to free grace alone. Upon this glorious plan, the comfortable doctrines of abſolute predeſtination and final perſeverance, are (indirectly at leaſt) contended for and eſtabliſhed; and as our great Zerub-

babel

babel has all the honour of laying the foundation, so he has all the glory of finishing the superstructure. May these lines of Mr. F——r be ever written with the pen of gratitude upon my heart! If Mr. Wesley and Mr. Sellon can answer arguments like these, they will do great things indeed. Your doctrine of the natural depravity of the will, and of the power of free grace in rectifying, and of keeping it steady in the cause of God when it is rectified, you have illustrated in Bunyan's character of *Lord Will-be-Will*. I have just turned to the place you refer to in the Holy War; and I find that this *Lord Will-be-Will* was one of the chief generals under Diabolus, or the Devil himself. And that "*Nothing at all pleased* LORD WILL-BE-WILL *but what pleased* DIABOLUS *his* LORD [A]."

Therefore we find, that when the *town of Man-soul* was besieged by EMMANUEL, this LORD WILL-BE-WILL (who was the *strong man armed*) stood it out with all his might and power, till *the stronger than he* came into the castle, and *spoiled him of all the armour wherein he trusted*. How therefore you could bring this character of LORD WILL-BE-WILL in proof of the natural freedom of the will to good, is to me very amazing; yet, by so doing you have given us a striking demonstration how the natural man's will stands it out against grace to the very last gasp, even till it is compelled to yield to the sovereign power

---

[A] Bunyan's remarks in the margin opposite these places are, *The will takes place under Diabolus. The carnal will opposeth conscience*, And so very zealous was this good old Puritan preacher against the doctrine of *free-will*, that he absolutely places all the *Election doubters*, or those who were not clear in the belief of absolute predestination, among the numerous hosts of the *Diabolonians*, and bitter enemies to the town of *Man-soul*. One of these *Election-doubters* being brought before the judge, and pleading, that "he had always been brought "up in that religion," the Judge replies, "To question election, is "to overthrow a great doctrine of the gospel, (to wit) the omni-"science, power and will of God; to take away the liberty of God "with his creature; to stumble the faith of the town of Man-soul; "and to make salvation to depend upon works, and not upon grace. "It also belied the word, and disquieted the minds of the men of "Man-soul; therefore by the best of laws he (the *Election-doubter*) "must die." Mr. Whitefield's edition of Bunyan, vol. II. p. 104. I say Mr. Whitefield's edition, because Mr. Wesley, not well relishing the title of a *Diabolonian, a belyar of God's word*, and a *disquieter of the minds of the men of Man soul*, has prudently expunged this whole passage out of his edition of the Holy War.

of God; and when this is the caſe, then *Lord Will-be-Will* fights as zealouſly under his new maſter EMMANUEL, as he did before under his old Lord DIABOLUS.

Let good old learned Dr. Fulke, who had ſo deep a controverſy with the Jeſuits in Queen Elizabeth's time, upon the articles of predeſtination, free-will, man's inability to merit, and imputed righteouſneſs, (all which he defended againſt theſe ſubtle enemies of God's grace) now give his teſtimony on the point in hand; and we ſhall find that you (in your laſt Calviniſtic paragraph) and he, and I, and John Bunyan, and Mr. Weſley, in the note and in the extract from the Chriſtian Library before quoted, are all unanimous on the ſubject of the natural and rectified will.

Upon Rom. viii. 30, this great light of our reformed church thus expreſſeth himſelf. "The eternal predeſtination of God "excludeth the merits of man, and the power of his will "thereby to attain to eternal life; yet forceth not a man's "will to good or ill, but altereth the will of him that is "ordained to life, from evil to good, and giveth power to "chooſe that which is good, and all means which he hath "appointed unto ſalvation. And this is the doctrine of St. "Auguſtin in all his books againſt the Pelagians, wherein he "declareth the effect of God's predeſtination; as he that will "read may eaſily perceive." *Fulke.*

To the very ſame purpoſe Biſhop Hopkins, *in his third Sermon on the new birth*, whoſe teſtimony I prefer to any other, becauſe you yourſelf have given us a long quotation from his works, and allow him to have been a truly converted man.

"That the liberty of the will may not violate the certainty "of God's purpoſe and decree, he changeth it by the power "of his irreſiſtible grace; and yet that this irreſiſtible grace may "not violate the liberty of the will, he perſuades it by ſuch "powerful and rational arguments that it ſhould not act "freely if it ſhould diſſent from it. Though God uſeth an "infinite power in regenerating and converting a ſoul, yet he "uſeth no violence; he *ſubdues* the will, but he doth not "*compel* it. This is that victorious grace, that doth not more "overcome a ſinner's reſiſtances than it doth his prejudices; "it overcomes all oppoſitions by its own irreſiſtible power, "and it overcomes all prejudices by its attracting ſweetneſs; "and when it brings a ſinner to ſubmit to God, it makes him "apprehend alſo, that it is his chiefeſt happineſs and joy ſo to "do. This is the ſweet nature of regenerating grace; and it "is the ſame winning ſweetneſs that afterwards preſerves the "regenerate from a total apoſtacy from grace; for though "there

" there is a conſtant ſupply of grace to keep them, that they " ſhall never certainly draw back to perdition, yet, withal, " their own freedom is ſuch that they may if they will; but " how can they will it, ſince the will never inclines but to " that which moſt pleaſeth it, and nothing pleaſeth a regene- " rate and ſanctified will ſo much, as that ſovereign good that " comprehends in it all other good, and that is God himſelf? " And thus you ſee how God diſpoſeth of the will of man, in " changing it to himſelf, without conſtraining of it, turning " it, as unforcibly, ſo infallibly to himſelf, when he draws it " by the ſweetneſs of his own efficacious inſpirations. And " thus I have diſpatched the firſt particular, in ſhewing you " after what manner the ſpirit of God works this change on " the will, by perſuading it with rational arguments that it " cannot gainſay, and by overcoming it by his irreſiſtible grace " that it cannot oppoſe." Biſhop Hopkins.

With this quotation I conclude all I have to advance on the point of free will; and I think, if it were properly attended to, it would prevent many diſputes among real Chriſtians: For my own part, I have not the leaſt objection to the expreſſion of *free-will*, and find it uſed in a very ſound ſenſe by St. Auguſtin, Luther and Calvin, the grand patrons for the doctrine of man's natural inability to will that which is good ſince the fall. God does not *force* any man to will either good or evil; but man, through the corruption of his underſtanding, naturally and *freely wills* that which is evil; till being wrought upon and enlightened by converting grace, he as *freely wills* that which is good as before he *freely willed* the evil. Take a familiar illuſtration. Place before a little child ſome toys, or ſugar-plumbs, as alſo the title to a great eſtate; ſay to the child, " Chooſe which you will;" the infant will immediately take the former, and *freely* too, no compulſion at all being laid on the will. But when this infant is grown to years of maturity, when its underſtanding is opened, and it no longer thinks as a child, ſpeaks as a child, and acts as a child, then place before him the toys and the eſtate, and he will as freely chooſe the latter, as in the ſtate of misjudging infancy he choſe the former. The application is too eaſy to need an illuſtration. In this ſenſe the Aſſembly of divines ſpeak of *the natural liberty of the will*, and affirm that *it is not forced*. But it ſhould ſeem as if they did not herein *lean enough towards Calviniſm* for Mr. Weſley, who tells us, in his Preſervative againſt Unſettled Notions in Religion (p. 192), *They* (the aſſembly) *ſay, Man hath a will which is naturally free*; we ſay, *Man hath this freedom of will, not naturally, but by grace.*"

As the doctrine of ſinleſs perfection is not confined to any particular part of your book, but is diffuſed thro' the whole, rather than break the chain of my arguments to controvert it wherever it occurs, I ſhall beg leave to make it the ſubject of another epiſtle; however, before I conclude this, muſt take a review of your ſecond letter in the ſame manner I did of your firſt.

[I.]

P. 33. After ſome favourable inſinuations in behalf of Myſticiſm, you point out Solomon as THE CHIEF OF MYSTICS. But, if Solomon was a Myſtic, then Chriſt and the prophets and apoſtles were Myſtics too; for you will hardly affirm, that they taught a contrary doctrine to Solomon. Again, if Solomon was a Myſtic, your panegyrick upon Mr. Romaine is very ill beſtowed, for I am ſure he has entirely perverted Solomon's plan, in his Twelve Sermons on the Canticles; and though I ſhould be as unwilling to burn Solomon's Song as yourſelf, yet if he were ſo great a Myſtic as you ſay, it is high time that Mr. Romaine's diſcourſes upon that ſong, as well as *his edifying Paraphraſe on the 107th Pſalm*, were either burnt or *recanted*, with Mr. Shirley's Sermons.

[II.]

In your zeal to eſtabliſh free-will, you ſay, "*you are "grieved at the great advantage we give infidels againſt the "goſpel, by making it* (what you call) *ridiculous.*" But would you give up any one goſpel truth in order to make it palatable to *real* infidels, after exclaiming ſo much againſt making it palatable to thoſe whom you *improperly* ſtile Antinomians? Diveſt the goſpel of its truths, and it is no more a goſpel; and if you would preach ſuch a goſpel as infidels would not find fault with, you muſt immediately ſweep away the doctrines of the Incarnation, the Trinity, original ſin, the atonement, the influences of the ſpirit, and juſtification by faith alone in the imputed Righteouſneſs of Chriſt. But let me aſk, Sir, do you really preach a goſpel that infidels cannot find fault with? Then I am ſure it is not Paul's goſpel; for we find that *his* goſpel *pleaſed not men*, and was *not after man*, but was liable to be perverted, abuſed, ſlandered, &c. &c. yea, that it was accounted fooliſhneſs and *ridiculouſneſs* itſelf by the wiſe, the great, and the learned infidels of the age.

[III.]

In your quotation from Baxter's Catholic Theology, in order to *eſtabliſh* the merit of works, you have *eſtabliſhed* a very falſe hypotheſis, and then no wonder that the concluſion you have drawn

drawn from it is equally rotten. It is, that *reward and merit are relative words*, as *guilt and punishment*, *master and servant*: But surely this is not the case; because, a reward may be of *grace*, when there is no *merit* at all; but there can be no servant without a master, nor can there be any just punishment without guilt. Again, you follow Mr. Baxter in a most erroneous conclusion, when he intimates, that if there is no *merit* in good works, there is no *demerit* in bad ones. Now, for the very same reason that we speak of the *demerit* of sin, we are afraid to say there is any *merit* in the best works of the best men; *viz.* because we believe they are tainted *with sin* and *imperfection*; and indeed, though we render the words καλὰ ἔργα *goods works*, yet the exact translation is *ornamental works*; and truly, when brought to the strictness of the law, they deserve not the name of *good*. But however grating the expressions may sound to those who hope to attain a second Justification by their works, yet we have scripture authority to call them dung, dross, and filthy rags. Instead therefore of being puffed up with a vain conceit of the *merit* even of our best performances, let us remember the words of good Bishop Cowper, who, in his piece on the prodigal son's conversion, tells us, that "The doctrine of *merit* is learned out of the "school of nature, wherein all proud *Justiciars*, whatever "show of external piety they have, are but con disciples with "this forlorn child."

Two quotations, one from Archbishop Leighton, (whom you would also press into your service) another from Bishop Hopkins, shall conclude this letter.

"There have been great disputes about the *merit* of good "works; but I truly think, they who have laboriously en-"gaged in them, have been very idly, though very eagerly "employed about nothing; since the very schoolmen them-"selves acknowledge, that there can be no such thing as "*meriting* from the blessed God, in the human, or to speak "more accurately, in any created nature whatsoever. Nay, "so far from any possibility of *merit*, there can be no room "for reward any otherwise than of the sovereign pleasure, "and gracious kindness of God: And the more antient wri-"ters, when they use the word *merit*, mean nothing by it, "but a certain correlate to that reward which God both pro-"mises and bestows, of mere grace and benignity; other-"wise, in order to constitute what is properly called *merit*, "many things must occur, which *no man in his senses* will "presume to attribute to human works, though ever so ex-"cellent; particularly, that the thing done must not previ-

ously

As the doctrine of ſinleſs perfection is not confined to any particular part of your book, but is diffuſed thro' the whole, rather than break the chain of my arguments to controvert it wherever it occurs, I ſhall beg leave to make it the ſubject of another epiſtle; however, before I conclude this, muſt take a review of your ſecond letter in the ſame manner I did of your firſt.

[I.]

P. 33. After ſome favourable inſinuations in behalf of Myſticiſm, you point out Solomon as THE CHIEF OF MYSTICS. But, if Solomon was a Myſtic, then Chriſt and the prophets and apoſtles were Myſtics too; for you will hardly affirm, that they taught a contrary doctrine to Solomon. Again, if Solomon was a Myſtic, your panegyrick upon Mr. Romaine is very ill beſtowed, for I am ſure he has entirely perverted Solomon's plan, in his Twelve Sermons on the Canticles; and though I ſhould be as unwilling to burn Solomon's Song as yourſelf, yet if he were ſo great a Myſtic as you ſay, it is high time that Mr. Romaine's diſcourſes upon that ſong, as well as *his edifying Paraphraſe on the 107th Pſalm*, were either burnt or *recanted*, with Mr. Shirley's Sermons.

[II.]

In your zeal to eſtabliſh free-will, you ſay, "*you are* "*grieved at the great advantage we give infidels againſt the* "*goſpel, by making it* (what you call) *ridiculous.*" But would you give up any one goſpel truth in order to make it palatable to *real* infidels, after exclaiming ſo much againſt making it palatable to thoſe whom you *improperly* ſtile Antinomians? Diveſt the goſpel of its truths, and it is no more a goſpel; and if you would preach ſuch a goſpel as infidels would not find fault with, you muſt immediately ſweep away the doctrines of the Incarnation, the Trinity, original ſin, the atonement, the influences of the ſpirit, and juſtification by faith alone in the imputed Righteouſneſs of Chriſt. But let me aſk, Sir, do you really preach a goſpel that infidels cannot find fault with? Then I am ſure it is not Paul's goſpel; for we find that *his* goſpel *pleaſed not men*, and was *not after man*, but was liable to be perverted, abuſed, ſlandered, &c. &c. yea, that it was accounted fooliſhneſs and *ridiculouſneſs* itſelf by the wiſe, the great, and the learned infidels of the age.

[III.]

In your quotation from Baxter's Catholic Theology, in order to *eſtabliſh* the merit of works, you have *eſtabliſhed* a very falſe hypotheſis, and then no wonder that the concluſion you have drawn

drawn from it is equally rotten. It is, that *reward and merit are relative words*, as *guilt and punishment*, *master and servant*: But surely this is not the case; because, a reward may be of *grace*, when there is no *merit* at all; but there can be no servant without a master, nor can there be any just punishment without guilt. Again, you follow Mr. Baxter in a most erroneous conclusion, when he intimates, that if there is no *merit* in good works, there is no *demerit* in bad ones. Now, for the very same reason that we speak of the *demerit* of sin, we are afraid to say there is any *merit* in the best works of the best men; *viz.* because we believe they are tainted *with sin* and *imperfection*; and indeed, though we render the words καλὰ ἔργα *goods works*, yet the exact translation is *ornamental works*; and truly, when brought to the strictness of the law, they deserve not the name of *good*. But however grating the expressions may sound to those who hope to attain a second Justification by their works, yet we have scripture authority to call them dung, dross, and filthy rags. Instead therefore of being puffed up with a vain conceit of the *merit* even of our best performances, let us remember the words of good Bishop Cowper, who, in his piece on the prodigal son's conversion, tells us, that "The doctrine of *merit* is learned out of the "school of nature, wherein all proud *Justiciars*, whatever "show of external piety they have, are but con disciples with "this forlorn child."

Two quotations, one from Archbishop Leighton, (whom you would also press into your service) another from Bishop Hopkins, shall conclude this letter.

"There have been great disputes about the *merit* of good "works; but I truly think, they who have laboriously en-"gaged in them, have been very idly, though very eagerly "employed about nothing; since the very schoolmen them-"selves acknowledge, that there can be no such thing as "*meriting* from the blessed God, in the human, or to speak "more accurately, in any created nature whatsoever. Nay, "so far from any possibility of *merit*, there can be no room "for reward any otherwise than of the sovereign pleasure, "and gracious kindness of God: And the more antient wri-"ters, when they use the word *merit*, mean nothing by it, "but a certain correlate to that reward which God both pro-"mises and bestows, of mere grace and benignity; other-"wise, in order to constitute what is properly called *merit*, "many things must occur, which *no man in his senses* will "presume to attribute to human works, though ever so ex-"cellent; particularly, that the thing done must not previ-

ously

" ouſly be matter of debt, and muſt be entirely our own act,
" unaſſiſted by foreign aid; it muſt alſo be perfectly good,
" and bear an adequate proportion to the reward claimed in
" conſequence of it; if all theſe things ſhould not concur,
" the act cannot poſſibly ariſe to *merit*. Whereas, I think no
" one will venture to aſſert, that any one of theſe can take
" place in any human action whatever.

" But why ſhould I enlarge here, when one ſingle circum-
" ſtance overthrows all thoſe titles. The moſt righteous of
" mankind would not be able to ſtand, if his works were
" weighed in the balance of ſtrict juſtice; how much leſs then
" could they DESERVE that immenſe glory which is now
" in queſtion?

" Nor is this only to be denied concerning the unbeliever
" and ſinner, but CONCERNING THE RIGHTEOUS
" AND PIOUS BELIEVER, who is not only free from all
" the guilt of his former impenitence and rebellion, but en-
" dowed with the gift of the ſpirit. The interrogation here
" expreſſes the moſt vehement negation, and ſignifies that no
" mortal in whatever degree he is placed, if he be called to
" the ſtrict examination of divine juſtice, without daily and
" repeated forgiveneſs, could be able to keep his ſtanding, and
" much leſs could he be able to ariſe to that glorious height.
" That *merit* (ſays Bernard) on which my hope relies, conſiſts
" in theſe three things, the love of adoption, the truth of the
" promiſe, and the power of its performance." This is the
" threefold cord which cannot be broken."

Abp. Leighton's Med. on Pſa. cxxx. ver. 3.

To the ſame purpoſe Biſhop Hopkins. " It is a fooliſh pre-
" ſumption and intolerable arrogance, to think we can *deſerve*
" any thing at the hands of God, unleſs it be his wrath by
" our ſins." For,

1ſt. " In all proper *merit* there muſt be an equivalence, or
" at leaſt a proportion of worth between the work and the
" reward; which to imagine between our obedience and the
" heavenly glory, is to exalt the one infinitely too high, and
" to abaſe the other infinitely too low."

2dly. " The very grace that enables us to do the command-
" ments of God is freely beſtowed upon us by himſelf; and
" therefore the obedience we perform unto him merely by his
" own aſſiſtance, cannot be ſaid (without a grand impropriety)
" to *merit* any reward from him."

3dly. " All our obedience is imperfect; and therefore, if
" it *deſerve* any thing, it is only puniſhment for the defects
" and failures of it."

4thly.

4thly. " Suppoſe it were perfect, which it is not, yet it is " no more than our bounden duty, and duty can never be " *meritorious.*"

I have nothing more to add at preſent; but that upon looking over Archbiſhop Uſher's Letters, in his Life, written by Dr. Parr, I find one to his friend Dr. Samuel Ward, then Lady Margaret's profeſſor of divinity, and maſter of Sydney-College in the univerſity of Cambridge; wherein he tells him, that he is deeply engaged in a controverſy with a Jeſuit, upon the points of *free will* and man's *merit*, which doctrines this Jeſuit ſtrenuouſly defended in behalf of the Romiſh church. A pregnant proof from what ſource theſe two doctrines (which have been the ſubject of my preſent epiſtle) are really and truly derived. I am ſorry, Sir, to find and to leave you in ſuch company; but as I have matter enough before me for the ſubject of two or three more letters, I muſt haſten to ſubſcribe myſelf,

Reverend Sir,

Your moſt humble Servant,

The Author of P. O.

P. S. Though I have granted Mr. F——r his own interpretation of that text, *I would and ye would not*, yet many ſound and learned divines apply it to the Scribes and Phariſees; and, indeed, the context ſeems greatly to favor this ſenſe of the words. Otherwiſe (if addreſſed to Jeruſalem) our Lord would have ſaid, THOU WOULDEST NOT, inſtead of, YE WOULD NOT. Nay, the paſſage is not grammatical upon any other plan. But if we read it, *O Jeruſalem, Jeruſalem, how oft would I have gathered you, and ye* (Scribes and Phariſees) *would not*, &c. then we not only preſerve the grammar of the words (ουκ ηθελησατε) but have an eaſy and natural elucidation of them. The reader is deſired to examine the whole paſſage, Luke xiii. from ver. 31 to the end.

LETTER

LETTER III.

REVEREND SIR,

ALTHOUGH you have not made the doctrine of ſinleſs perfection the ſubject of any one of your Letters, yet the ſcent of it is diffuſed throughout your whole book; I cannot ſay like *the lilly of the valley*, or *the roſe of Sharon*, but *like dead flies, which cauſe the ointment of the apothecary to ſend forth a ſtinking ſavour*. Pardon the force of my expreſſion, Sir; but I cannot help entirely acquieſcing with the late Mr. Whitefield (who you tell us "ſpoke the words of ſoberneſs and TRUTH, with divine pathos, and floods of tears declarative of his ſincerity"), that "*The monſtrous doctrine of ſinleſs* "*perfection for a while turns ſome of its deluded votaries into* "*temporary monſters* [C]." However, for this doctrine you are

[C] Vol. iii. p. 337. Mr. Whitefield's letter addreſſed to W——. P—, Eſq. dated June 2d, 1766.

Mr. Whitefield lived to ſee this aſſertion verified in many particulars; and Mr. Weſley's own Journals are not without examples of the truth of it; as might be proved from the caſes of B—l, H—s, &c. &c. &c. the former of whom aſſumed to himſelf the gift of diſcerning ſpirits; and about eight years ago pretended to have a commiſſion from God to tell the people that the world would be at an end on the 28th day of February. The latter, H—s, a flaming teacher of ſinleſs perfection, was ſeized with raving madneſs as he was working in his garden, and died blaſpheming in a moſt dreadful manner.

A friend of mine lately informed me, that an eminent preacher of Perfection told him, that he had not ſinned for ſome years, and that the Holy Ghoſt had deſcended and ſat upon him and many others, in a viſible manner, as upon the Apoſtles on the day of Pentecoſt. But my friend not having an implicit faith in the relation, the gentleman ſhewed him that no man in England was more *perfect* in rage than himſelf.

Laſt year, I myſelf converſed with a gentlewoman of ſuch high perfection, that ſhe ſaid *no man could teach her any thing*; upon which account ſhe did not go to any place of worſhip for months or years together. However, that moſt unruly member, her tongue, was continually proving to thoſe about her, that ſhe was under a *perfect* deluſion of the devil; whilſt the black and blue marks upon the

are without diſguiſe an advocate; though your manner of writing evinces that you are as yet far enough from the poſſeſſion of the thing contended for; ſince you ſtill go down to the Philiſtines to ſharpen the ax, the mattock, and the coulter, of ſneer, ſarcaſm, and perverſion; blaming "the inconſiſtency

---

the unhappy ſervant-maid gave ample demonſtration, that if the miſtreſs was herſelf *perfect in the fleſh*, ſhe had made the poor girl quite otherwiſe; and I am ſure, if I had been called to give my evidence, I could have proved that ſhe was a *perfect* cheat.

The Queriſt (before mentioned) reminds Mr. Weſley of one who told God in prayer, that he was perfect as he (God) himſelf was perfect; and I could alſo inform him of another *perfect* blaſphemer, who prayed in a room with a few other perſons in the following ſhocking terms: "Grant, O Lord, that all here preſent may be holy "as I am holy, and perfect as I am perfect."

I could alſo tell him, where he might ſee a certain woman who was ſo very perfect that ſhe tried to ſin and could not.

Mr. Weſley muſt alſo well remember a certain *perfect* married lady, who fancied that ſhe was to be the mother of a great prophet, by means of a *perfect* preacher for whom ſhe had conceived a *perfect* fondneſs; and though they did not (as we may preſume from their principles) *talk about finiſhed ſalvation, and againſt perfection in the fleſh*, like the man and woman you have inſtanced in the Pariſh of Madeley (See Mr. F——r's Vindication, p. 23), and like our naughty *orthodox free-grace celebrated* preachers, yet it is certain a *perfect* child was born; and ſo great was the proof that this child was the effect of this *perfect* connection, that it occaſioned a ſeparation between the lady and her huſband; but unfortunately the poor little prophet proved to be of the female ſex.

I hate the law of retaliation, and would not upon any account have mentioned theſe things, but you know, Sir, who has ſet me the example, even one who pleads heartily for ſinleſs perfection. But though I am no advocate for this opinion myſelf, yet I would not willingly follow you in your imperfections; and therefore aſſure you, that I have only brought theſe inſtances to light, in order to ſhew you, that if you will have recourſe to ſuch weapons, you will perhaps, in the end, find yourſelf over-matched. You received a hint in the Paris Converſation, of the great impropriety of expoſing individuals, and of blackening any ſyſtem of doctrines, on account of the practices of ſome who hold them; and I was in hopes, that in your laſt piece you would have made ſome little acknowledgments on this head: But you have not. Should you doubt of the truth of theſe inſtances, I will at any time lead you to the fountain-head of my intelligence; but as I am utterly averſe to that unhandſome way of ſtigmatizing names and characters, which Mr. Weſley adopts in his Journals, and in his letter to Mr. Hervey, I dare not be more explicit in what will appear before public view.

" (as you call it) of thoſe who publiſh hymns of ſolemn prayer " for perfection, whilſt they explode it as a pernicious doc- " trine [D]; and who *plead* for ſpiritual bondage, while " they talk of goſpel liberty, and affirm that *the ſon of the bond-* " *woman* ſhall always live *with the ſon of the free* [E]; that " ſin can never be caſt out of the heart of believers, and that " Chriſt and corruption ſhall always dwell together in this " world; who tell their hearers one hour that the love of " Chriſt ſweetly conſtrains all believers to walk, yea to run " the way of God's commandments, and that they cannot " help obeying its forcible dictates, whilſt they perſuade them " the next hour that how to perform what is good they find " not; that they fall continually into ſin; for that which they " do they allow not, but what they hate that do they.—And, " that theſe inconſiſtencies may not ſhock their common ſenſe, " or alarm their conſciences, they again touch the ſweet- " ſounding ſtring of *finiſhed ſalvation*, intimate they have the " key of evangelical knowledge, reflect on thoſe who expect de- " liverance from ſin in this life, and build up their congregations " in a moſt comfortable, I wiſh I could ſay moſt holy, faith."

Now, Sir, ſuppoſing all this to be juſt as you repreſent it, yet where is the inconſiſtency of it? If we believe that in all

---

[D] This inconſiſtency is peculiarly applicable to Mr. Weſley, vide Appendix.

[E] The pious old biſhop Cowper was one of thoſe preachers who (to uſe Mr. F——r's expreſſion) *ſo whetted the Antinomian appetite of his hearers*, as that he endeavored to make them ſwallow ſome of theſe Anti-perfection tenets; for on Rom. viii. 9, entitled, " *Com-* " *forts againſt the remnants of ſin*," he thus expreſſeth himſelf; " I compare the ſoul of man regenerate to the houſe of Abraham, " wherein there was both a free woman, Sarah, and a bond woman, " Hagar, with their children."

Again, " We have to mark for our comfort, how the Apoſtle calls " them ſpiritual men, in whom, notwithſtanding, remained fleſhly " corruption: The judgment of the Lord and Satan are contrary; " there is in you (ſaith the deceiver to the weak Chriſtian) fleſhly " corruption; therefore ye are carnal. There is in you (ſaith the " Lord) through my grace, a ſpiritual diſpoſition; therefore ye are " ſpiritual. Satan is ſo evil, that his eyes ſee nothing in the Chriſtian " but that which is evil; the Lord is ſo good, that his eyes ſee no " tranſgreſſion in Iſrael; he judgeth not his children by the remnants " of their old corruption, but by the beginnings of his renewing grace " in us; *one dram of the grace of Chriſt in the ſoul of a Chriſtian,* " *makes him more precious in the eyes of God* than any remnant of " corruption in him can make him odious."

the

the regenerate there are two principles, flesh and spirit, nature and grace, and that these two are at an irreconcilable variance, then ministers must suit their discourses to their hearers (who are believers) as having both these principles dwelling in them, and in so doing they strictly follow the apostolic doctrine, which teacheth, that even in the best of God's children (for to such the epistle is addressed) *the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh; so that they cannot do the things that they would.* And to adopt the words of excellent Mr. Jenks before mentioned (once rector of a parish not very far distant from Madeley), "I must see better arguments than ever I have "yet seen, to convince me that St. Paul does not speak his own "experience in the seventh chapter to the Romans, when he "says, With the mind I MYSELF *serve the law of God; but* "*with the flesh the law of sin.*" And I am certain that any minister of the church of England gives but a very *imperfect* proof of his own *perfection* who can maintain with his lips and pen, that the very *in-being* of sin is taken out of any believer whatsoever, whilst he has already with his hand (and according to his own declaration, with *his heart* also) subscribed the ninth article of that church which declares in such positive terms, that "the flesh lusteth ALWAYS contrary to the "spirit; and that this infection of nature doth remain, yea, "in them that are regenerated, whereby the lust of the flesh is "not subject to the law of God;" &c. &c. (F).

If, therefore, we are to abide by the testimonies of Scripture and of our own church on this head, as well as that of all the Saints both of the Old and New Testament, (not one of whom can be produced as totally free from indwelling sin,) it were much to be wished that you had *recanted*, or rather, that you had never advanced, that unauthorized position, that there are very few of our *celebrated pulpits, where more has not been said at times for sin than against it.* Grant that in these *celebrated pulpits* it is often said, that, "*sin will humble us*;" how is this *pleading for that murderer of souls with an air of positiveness and assurance?* It is surely a very strange way of pleading in the behalf of any thing, to represent it as that which ought to cause the deepest shame and humiliation of spirit; and if you are exasperated at

(F) Mr. Wesley very properly blames Dr. Dodd, when editor of the Christian Magazine, for inserting a paper into that work in vindication of sinless perfection; which Mr. Wesley (like a true minister of the church of England) observes is directly contrary to our ninth article. See the note in Mr. Wesley's Sermon on ii. Cor. v. 17.

any celebrated miniſters (for it is not the pulpit which ſpeaks) and call them Antinomians, or *pleaders for ſin*, becauſe they aſſert that *ſin will humble us*, then you will be found to reflect upon God himſelf, who left king Hezekiah to his ſin which he committed, in ſhewing the king of Babylon his treaſures, expreſsly that he might *try him, and ſhew him all that was in his heart.* Nay, if a celebrated preacher ſhould even ſay, that *ſin will endear Chriſt*, the expreſſion (properly taken) is perfectly agreeable to the analogy of faith; for did not our Lord himſelf tell the proud Phariſee, who deſpiſed a poor creature bowed down and laden with ſins, even a *five hundred pence debtor, that* "*to whom much is forgiven the ſame loveth much.*" And what is this more than your favorite practical writer, as well as mine, Biſhop Hopkins, hath aſſerted in his Sermon on Pſalm xix. 13, where, laying down various reaſons why God leaves a proneneſs to ſin in his own children, among others he gives the two following; "*That the prevalency of Chriſt's in-*"*terceſſion is hereby glorified,*" and "*the graces of his people* "*the more exerciſed?*" "Some graces, ſaith he, are graces of "war, if I may ſo call them, which would never be exerciſed "if we had not enemies to encounter with; and therefore "as it is ſaid in Judges iii. 2, that God would not utterly "drive out all the nations before the children of Iſrael, but "left ſome of them among them, that by continual fighting "with them *they might learn war*; ſo neither hath God ut-"terly expelled the ſpiritual Canaanites out of the hearts of "his people, to this end, that by daily conflicting with them, "they might learn the wars of the Lord, and grow expert "in handling and uſing every piece of their ſpiritual and "Chriſtian armour. How ſhould we keep up a holy watch "and ward, if we had no enemies to beat up our quarters? How "ſhould we exerciſe faith, which St. John tells us is our vic-"tory, if we had no enemies to conquer? How ſhould we ex-"erciſe repentance and godly ſorrow, whereby the ſoul is re-"cruited and it's graces reinforced, if we were never foiled "nor overcome by our ſpiritual enemies? Part of our ſpiritual "armour would ſoon ruſt, but that our corruptions and ſinful "inclinations put us daily upon a neceſſity of uſing it. And "therefore, as he ſays in another place, in the ſame Sermon, "The holieſt Chriſtian hath, and ſhall have, as long as he "lives in this world, cauſe to complain with the Apoſtle [C], "*I ſee another law in my members warring againſt the law in* "*my mind.* There is a carnal, ſenſual inclination in him,

[C] Bp. Hopkins is clear that the Apoſtle ſpoke in his own perſon. "ſtrongly

" ſtrongly ſwaying him to ſin, contrary to the bent and in-
" clination of his renewed part; and therefore he ſhall have
" cauſe ſtill to cry out, *O wretched man that I am, who ſhall*
" *deliver me from the body of this death!*"

Now, Sir, will you depreciate the memory of this good man, as you have done the living CELEBRATED miniſters of this day, by repreſenting him as a *pleader for ſin*, becauſe he ſpeaks comfortable words to God's poor children who groan under the remains of it? I hope you have too much politeneſs to call him, with *an air of poſitiveneſs and aſſurance*, one of the *Devil's factors* and an *advocate for ſin*, as a certain clergyman, whom you eſteem as *the greateſt miniſter in the world*, has already called all thoſe who teach that indwelling ſin remains in the heart as long as we continue in the body [D].

But not to dwell any longer on this point, I proceed to ſhew from whence this doctrine of ſinleſs perfection is alſo derived. For it was not (as ſome ſuppoſe) originally broached by Mr. John Weſley, but crept into the church firſt among the Pelagians, in the fifth century, and has been ſince almoſt generally received in the church of Rome, particularly by the Jeſuits, as we may very readily perceive by the following extract from Biſhop Cowper, who in his excellent comment on the eighth chapter to the Romans thus writes [E].

" There are ſome, ſaith St. Auguſtin, like unto veſſels blown
" up with wind, filled with a haughty ſpirit, not ſolidly great,
" but ſwelled with the ſickneſs of pride, who dare be bold
" to ſay, that men are found on earth without ſin: of ſuch
" as theſe he demands in that ſame place; " *Interrogo te, O*
" *home, ſancte, juſte, ſine macula, oratio iſta, Dimitte nobis*
" *debita noſtra, fidelium eſt, an catechumenorum? Certé regene-*
" *ratorum eſt, immo filiorum, nam ſi non eſt filiorum, qua fronte*
" *dicitur, Pater noſter qui es in Cœlis? Ubi ergo eſtis, O juſti,*
" *ſancti, in quibus peccata non ſunt?*" " *I demand of thee, O*
" *man, thou who art juſt, holy, and without ſpot* [F], *this prayer,*
" *Forgive us our ſins, whether it is a prayer to be ſaid by catechiſts*
" *only, or to be ſaid alſo of ſuch as are believers and converted Chriſ-*
" *tians? Surely it is the prayer of men regenerated; yea, it is*
" *the prayer of the ſons of God; for if it be not, with what*
" *aſſurance can they call God, Our Father who art in Heaven?*

[D] Hymns and Sacred Poems, by J. and C. Weſley, vol. II. p. 286.

[E] The doctrine of ſinleſs perfection was alſo commonly received among that ranting ſet of people called Anabaptiſts (very different from the preſent Baptiſts) in Luther's time; and under the notion of their being without ſin, they worked all manner of iniquity.

[F] St. Auguſtin ſpeaks this ironically.

" *Where*

" *Where then are ye, O ye juſt and holy ones, in whom are no* " *ſins* [G]? If the regenerate and ſons of God have need to " crave remiſſion of ſins, what are ye who ſay ye have no " ſin? If we ſay we have no ſin, we lie, and the truth is not " in us: and our bleſſed Saviour, to let us ſee how far we are " from doing that which we ſhould do, ſaith, *When ye have* " *done all that ye can do, yet ſay ye are unprofitable ſervants.* " Where, becauſe they have a ſilly ſubterfuge, that albeit we " were never ſo righteous, yet for humility ſake, we ſhould " ſay we are unprofitable, I anſwer them, as Auguſtine an- " ſwered the ſame objection in his time, " *Propter humilitatem* " *ergo mentiris; then for humility's ſake thou lieſt;*" but it is " certain, Chriſt never taught any man to lie for humility: this " is therefore but a forged falſhood. And to join the third wit- " neſs with the former two, *Bernard*, who lived in a very cor- " rupt time, yet retained this truth: " *Quis eſt melior Propheta?* " *de quo dixit Deus, Inveni virum ſecundum cor meum; & ta-* " *men ipſe neceſſe habuit dicere Deo,* " *Ne intres in judicium* " *cum ſervo tuo?*" " *Who is better than the Prophet David?* " *of whom the Lord ſaid, I have found a man after mine* " *own heart; yet had he need to ſay, Lord, enter not into* " *judgment with thy ſervant.*" And again, " *Sufficit mihi* " *ad omnem juſtitiam ſolum habere propitium, cui ſoli peccavi:* " *non peccare Dei juſtitia eſt, hominis juſtitia indulgentia* " *Dei.*" " *It ſufficeth me for all righteouſneſs to have him only* " *merciful to me whom I have only offended: to be without ſin* " *is the righteouſneſs of God, man's righteouſneſs is God's indul-* " *gence pardoning his ſin.*" We conclude therefore with him: " *Vae generationi huic miſeræ, cui ſufficere videtur ſua inſuffi-* " *cientia; immo inopia tanta, quis enim ad perfectionem illam* " *quam ſcripturæ tradunt, vel aſpirare videtur? Woe to this* " *miſerable generation, to whom their own inſufficiency ſeems ſuffi-* " *cient: for who is it that hath ſo much as aſpired to that per-* " *fection which the holy ſcripture commands us?* But to main- " tain their error, they enforce thoſe places of holy ſcripture " wherein mention is made of innocency, juſtice and perfection " in the godly; whereupon they ſimply infer, that the law is " fulfilled. Their paralogiſmes ſhall eaſily be diſcovered, if we " keep Auguſtine's rule, " When the perfection of any man " is mentioned, we muſt conſider wherein, for a man may " be righteous in compariſon of others; ſo Noah was a righ- " teous man in compariſon of that generation wherein he

[G] Permit me here to aſk the following queſtion. Was it not propoſed at a certain conference, Whether a believer might not be in ſuch a ſtate as not to need the interceſſion of Chriſt; and whether ſuch an one had any cauſe to pray for forgiveneſs of ſins?

" lived,

" lived, yet was he not without ſin."—A man may be alſo " ſo called in compariſon of himſelf, the Lord judging a " man according to that whereunto the greater part of his " diſpoſition is inclined; for the Lord doth repute and ac- " count his children, not after the remnants of the old man, " but according to the new workmanſhip of his grace in " them; whereof it cometh to paſs, that albeit, in a great " part they be ſinful, yet the Lord giveth unto them the " names of ſaints and righteous men."

" Again, in handling of the Apoſtle's words, *Let us, as* " *many as are perfect, be thus minded*, he moves the queſ- " tion, ſeeing that the Apoſtle hath ſaid immediately before, " that he was not perfect, How doth he now rank himſelf " among thoſe who are perfect? How agree theſe two, that " he is perfect, and that he is not perfect? He anſwers, the " Apoſtle was perfect, *ſecundum intentionem, non ſecundum* " *præventionem*; that is, *perfect in regard of his intention and* " *purpoſe, not in regard of prevention, and obtaining of his* " *purpoſe.*—And hereunto agrees that of Bernard, *Magnum* " *illud electionis vas perfectum abnuit, profectum fatetur*; " *That great choſen veſſel of election grants profection*, that is, " *a going forward, but denies perfection*; for, τελειος is not only " he who hath come to the end, but he alſo who is walking " toward it: We are ſo imperfect in this life, that we are yet " but walking to perfection: therefore (ſaith *Ambroſe*) " *Apoſ-* " *tolus aliquando quaſi perfectis loquitur, aliquando quaſi per-* " *fecturis; hoc eſt, aliquando laudat, aliquando commonet*;" " *The Apoſtle ſpeaketh unto Chriſtians, ſometimes as unto men* " *that are perfect, other times as unto men who are to perfect* " *that which is required of them; that is, ſometimes he praiſes* " *them for the good they have done, and other whiles he ad-* " *moniſhes them of the good they have to do.* We conclude, " therefore, with Auguſtine, " *Perfectio hominis eſt, inveniſſe* " *ſe non eſſe perfectum; this is* THE PERFECTION OF " MAN, TO FIND HE IS NOT PERFECT."

As you have given at leaſt an indirect inſinuation, (p. 61) that the incomparable Archbiſhop Leighton was an advocate for your ſinleſs perfection doctrine, I now beg to preſent you with the following abſtract from his Sermon on James iii. 17, by which you will clearly ſee what was this excellent prelate's opinion of the above doctrine, and of thoſe who profeſſed it.

" There is a generation indeed that is pure in their own " eyes, but they are ſuch as are not waſhen from their " filthineſs;—They that are waſhen, are ſtill bewailing that " they again contract ſo much defilement. The *moſt purified* " Chriſtians are they who are moſt ſenſible of their impurity.

" Therefore,

" Therefore, I called not this an univerſal freedom from pol-
" lution, but an univerſal deteſtation of it: They that are thus
" pure are daily defiled with many ſins, but they cannot be
" in love with any ſin at all, nor do they willingly diſpence
" with the ſmalleſt ſins." *Archbiſhop Leighton* [H].

Again, " The renewed man, even he that hath this law deep-
" eſt written in his heart, yet *while he lives here*, is ſtill mo-
" leſted with that inbred Antinomian, that law of ſin, which
" yet dwells in his fleſh, though the force of it is broken."

Archbiſhop Leighton's Sermon on Heb. viii. 10.

To the ſame purpoſe bleſſed Luther, ſpeaking of the battle between fleſh and ſpirit in the godly, thus writes:

" Of this battle, the hermits, the monks, and the ſchool-
" men, and all that ſeek righteouſneſs and ſalvation by works,
" know nothing at all."

But, " This battle of the fleſh againſt the ſpirit all the chil-
" dren of God have had and felt; and the ſelf-ſame do we al-
" ſo feel and prove: He that ſearcheth his own conſcience, if
" he be not an *hypocrite*, ſhall well perceive that to be true in
" himſelf which St. Paul here ſaith, *that the fleſh luſteth againſt*
" *the ſpirit*. All the faithful therefore do feel and confeſs that
" their fleſh reſiſteth againſt the ſpirit, and *that theſe two are*
" *ſo contrary the one to the other* in themſelves, that, do what
" they can, they are not able to perform that which they
" would do."

LUTHER on the GALATIANS, ch. v. ver. 17.

Again, " Here not only the ſchoolmen, but alſo ſome of
" the old fathers are much troubled, ſeeking how they may
" *excuſe* Paul; for it ſeemeth unto them abſurd and unſeem-
" ly to ſay, that that elect veſſel of Chriſt ſhould have ſin.
" But we credit Paul's own words, wherein he plainly con-
" feſſeth, that *he is ſold under ſin*; *that he is led captive of ſin*;
" that *he hath a law in his members rebelling againſt him*;
" and that *in his fleſh he ſerveth the law of ſin*.—Here again
" they anſwer, that the Apoſtle ſpeaketh in the perſon of the
" wicked. But the wicked do not complain of the rebellion
" of their fleſh, of any battle or conflict, or of the captivity
" and bondage of ſin; for ſin mightily *reigneth* in them.
" This is therefore the very complaint of Paul and all the
" faithful.—Wherefore THEY HAVE DONE VERY WICK-
" EDLY, which have excuſed Paul and all the faithful to have
" no ſin; for by this perſuaſion, (which proceedeth of igno-

[H] This extract from Archbiſhop Leighton ſtands in Mr. Weſley's Chriſtian Library, vol. XXXV. p. 18, as a noble teſtimony againſt the arrogant doctrine of ſinleſs perfection.

" rance

" rance of the doctrine of faith) they have robbed the church " of a ſingular conſolation;—they have aboliſhed the forgive- " neſs of ſins, and made Chriſt of none effect."

" It is very profitable for the godly to know this, and to " bear it well in mind, for it wonderfully comforteth them " when they are tempted. WHEN I WAS A MONK, I " thought by and by that I was utterly caſt away, if at any " time I felt the luſt of the fleſh; that is to ſay, if I felt any " evil motion, fleſhly luſt, wrath, hatred, or envy againſt " my brother. I eſſayed many ways to help to quiet my con- " ſcience, but it would not be; for the concupiſcence and " luſt of my fleſh did always return; ſo that I could not reſt, " but was continually vexed with theſe thoughts: This, of " that ſin thou haſt committed; thou art infected with envy, " with impatiency, and ſuch other ſins; therefore thou art " entered into this holy order in vain, and all thy good works " are unprofitable. If then I had rightly underſtood theſe ſen- " tences of Paul, *The fleſh luſteth contrary to the ſpirit, and* " *the ſpirit contrary to the fleſh, and theſe two are one againſt* " *another, ſo that ye cannot do the things that ye would do*, I " ſhould not ſo miſerably have tormented myſelf, but ſhould " have thought and ſaid to myſelf, as now commonly I do, " Martin, thou ſhalt not utterly be without ſin, for thou haſt " fleſh; thou ſhalt therefore feel the battle thereof, according " to that ſaying of St. Paul, *the fleſh reſiſteth the ſpirit*: Deſpair " not, therefore, but reſiſt it ſtrongly, and fulfill not the luſts " thereof; thus doing, thou art not under the law [L]."

LUTHER on the GALATIANS, ch. v. ver. 17.

BUT, ſaith Mr. F——r, (p. 68) by aſſerting, that " Sin ſhall " always dwell in *the inner chamber*, the inmoſt receſſes of the " heart, we give unto death, that foul monſter, the offspring of " ſin, the important honour of killing his father; he, he alone " is to give the great, the laſt, the deciſive blow. This is con- " fidently aſſerted by thoſe who cry, *Nothing but Chriſt*."

[L] If Mr. F——r ſhould think me tainted with Antinomianiſm, on account of my approbation of Luther's comment on the Galatians, I muſt ſtill fly for ſupport to my never-failing ally, Mr. John Weſley; who, though he tells us in his Journal, from Nov. 1739, to Sept. 1741, p. 89, That he is utterly aſhamed of himſelf for the high eſteem in which he once held this book; (the doctrine of which he even calls blaſphemous) yet, in a very late edition of his ſermon on Eph. ii. 8. the wind changes again into its firſt quarter, and he ſtyles Martin Luther, " THAT GLORIOUS CHAMPION OF THE LORD OF HOSTS," merely on account of his preaching that great doctrine, which runs throughout all his comment on the Galatians, *ſalvation by faith*.

Amazing aſſertion! What, Sir, do we make death the ſaviour, whilſt we declare that death itſelf is under the Saviour's feet? Or did that eminent martyr Lambert make death the ſaviour, when he cried out in the flames, his lower parts being almoſt conſumed, "NONE BUT CHRIST! "NONE BUT CHRIST!" Surely, Sir, when you talk on this wiſe you do not recollect, that death itſelf is no longer a *foul monſter* to a believer; but his ſting being taken out by the blood of Chriſt, he is now ranked among the Chriſtian's choiceſt bleſſings. Sin, both in its condemning and reigning power, being ſubdued in all the elect of God, the all-conquering JESUS enables them to face death in its moſt dreadful forms, as that welcome meſſenger which gives them their happy diſmiſſion from theſe tabernacles of clay in which *they groan, being burdened.* But we have juſt as much right to ſay, that you give death all the honour of ſaving you from bodily pain and ſickneſs, (which are the conſequences of ſin, though no puniſhments, but bleſſings to the believer) becauſe you acknowledge, that pain and ſickneſs will endure whilſt we are on this ſide the grave, as you have to accuſe us of making death the ſaviour from ſin, becauſe we affirm, that whilſt we are in the body, ſin is there alſo. Unleſs, therefore, you will prove that the ſinleſs ſtate you contend for is free from all the effects of ſin, viz. pain, ſickneſs, and even temporal death itſelf, your argument really proves too much, and abſolutely overthrows itſelf; upon which account, I think that the moſt conſiſtent Perfectioniſt was G—— B——l, who put himſelf at the head of a ſinleſs claſs in Mr. Weſley's ſocieties, and affirmed, *That the truly perfect ſhould never die, and that he himſelf is to be tranſlated as were Enoch and Elijah.* But although I would not charge the reverend authors of certain hymns with any ſuch extravagancies as theſe, yet I am ſure that if the doctrine of ſome of thoſe hymns be true, there is not a ſoul now upon earth that will ever ſee the face of God in glory. To inſtance only the following ſtanza:

Gifts, alas! cannot ſuffice,
And comforts all are vain;
WHILE ONE EVIL THOUGHT CAN RISE,
I AM NOT BORN AGAIN [M].

I cannot conclude this letter without taking notice of an evaſion which the Perfectioniſts run to when preſſed by the authority of the moral law. If they are aſked, "Do you

[M] Hymns and Sacred Poems by J. and C. Weſley, vol. II. p. 216, printed at London.

"keep

" keep the whole moral law in all its extent and ſpirituality?
" and if not, is not ſin the tranſgreſſion of the law, and are
" not you a ſinner?" they will anſwer, " We truſt we
" keep the whole law of love [N], and the whole law of
" Chriſt;" and then they fly to the old Popiſh diſtinction between infirmities and ſins, allowing that they have the former, but not the latter. This diſtinction Mr. Weſley contends for again and again, particularly in the preface to the before-mentioned hymns, in his ſermon on Eph. ii. 8. and on Rom. viii. 1. in his preface to Mr. Halyburton's life, and in his letter to Mr. Hervey; as does Mr. F——r in his firſt letter of the Vindication (p. 12); where he ſays, that " though the law
" of the ſpirit of life in Chriſt Jeſus will not deliver them
" from the *innocent infirmities of fleſh and blood*, it will ne-
" vertheleſs make them free from the law of ſin and death."
So likewiſe in many parts of his laſt piece, he ſpeaks of *the*

[N] Upon the queſtion being put home to thoſe who profeſs ſinleſs perfection, " Do you keep the whole law, without offending in
" one point?" Mr. Weſley in his anſwer, dated Dec. 28, 1762, replies, " I believe ſome would anſwer, We truſt we do keep the whole
" law of love." Being aſked again, " Do you defy God himſelf
" to find any ſin in you?" he anſwers, " We humbly hope (pray,
" Reader, mind the word *humbly*) God does not find ſin in us."—
Again, " Do you love God as well as you ought to love him, and
" ſerve him as he ought to be ſerved?" To this Mr. Weſley HUMBLY replies, " I love him with ALL my heart, and ſerve him with ALL
" my ſtrength." But I am ſure if he does this, he had no occaſion to ſoften the moral law, by calling it the law of love, for he fulfils its higheſt demands.

However, though Mr. Weſley flies to evaſions and equivocations, when aſked, " Do you keep the whole law in all its ſpirituality,
" without offending in one point, either in thought, word, or deed?"
yet one of his advocates has printed an anſwer to the Queriſt, dated Feb. 16, 1763, and (properly enough) ſigned ILLITERATE; in which he makes the following reply to the above queſtion: " If
" thou mean the MORAL LAW, I do." (i. e.) *I do keep it in all its ſpirituality, without offending in one point, either in thought, word, or deed.* The ſame Mr. ILLITERATE tells the Queriſt, that he has this teſtimony of himſelf in all things, " *Servant of God, well done*;"
that *he has* " *nothing to do with the law, either in point of juſtifica-*
" *tion or ſanctification.*" He then vindicates Mr. B—l, and others, for declaring they ſhould never die temporally; ſays, " *it remains to*
" *be proved that they are deluded in any, particularly in this point*;"
(i. e. of never dying temporally) and, after having accuſed the Queriſt of an *intimacy with the father of lies*, having called him a *wolf in ſheep's cloathing*, and a *ſecond Herod*, this meek Perfectioniſt *humbly* ſubſcribes himſelf his friend ILLITERATE.

Amazing aſſertion! What, Sir, do we make death the ſaviour, whilſt we declare that death itſelf is under the Saviour's feet? Or did that eminent martyr Lambert make death the ſaviour, when he cried out in the flames, his lower parts being almoſt conſumed, "NONE BUT CHRIST! "NONE BUT CHRIST!" Surely, Sir, when you talk on this wiſe you do not recollect, that death itſelf is no longer a *foul monſter* to a believer; but his ſting being taken out by the blood of Chriſt, he is now ranked among the Chriſtian's choiceſt bleſſings. Sin, both in its condemning and reigning power, being ſubdued in all the elect of God, the all-conquering JESUS enables them to face death in its moſt dreadful forms, as that welcome meſſenger which gives them their happy diſmiſſion from theſe tabernacles of clay in which *they groan, being burdened.* But we have juſt as much right to ſay, that you give death all the honour of ſaving you from bodily pain and ſickneſs, (which are the conſequences of ſin, though no puniſhments, but bleſſings to the believer) becauſe you acknowledge, that pain and ſickneſs will endure whilſt we are on this ſide the grave, as you have to accuſe us of making death the ſaviour from ſin, becauſe we affirm, that whilſt we are in the body, ſin is there alſo. Unleſs, therefore, you will prove that the ſinleſs ſtate you contend for is free from all the effects of ſin, viz. pain, ſickneſs, and even temporal death itſelf, your argument really proves too much, and abſolutely overthrows itſelf; upon which account, I think that the moſt conſiſtent Perfectioniſt was G—— B——l, who put himſelf at the head of a ſinleſs claſs in Mr. Weſley's ſocieties, and affirmed, *That the truly perfect ſhould never die, and that he himſelf is to be tranſlated as were Enoch and Elijah.* But although I would not charge the reverend authors of certain hymns with any ſuch extravagancies as theſe, yet I am ſure that if the doctrine of ſome of thoſe hymns be true, there is not a ſoul now upon earth that will ever ſee the face of God in glory. To inſtance only the following ſtanza:

Gifts, alas! cannot ſuffice,
And comforts all are vain;
WHILE ONE EVIL THOUGHT CAN RISE,
I AM NOT BORN AGAIN [M].

I cannot conclude this letter without taking notice of an evaſion which the Perfectioniſts run to when preſſed by the authority of the moral law. If they are aſked, "Do you

[M] Hymns and Sacred Poems by J. and C. Weſley, vol. II. p. 216, printed at London.

"keep

" keep the whole moral law in all its extent and ſpirituality?
" and if not, is not ſin the tranſgreſſion of the law, and are
" not you a ſinner?" they will anſwer, " We truſt we
" keep the whole law of love [N], and the whole law of
" Chriſt;" and then they fly to the old Popiſh diſtinction between infirmities and ſins, allowing that they have the former, but not the latter. This diſtinction Mr. Weſley contends for again and again, particularly in the preface to the beforementioned hymns, in his ſermon on Eph. ii. 8. and on Rom. viii. 1. in his preface to Mr. Halyburton's life, and in his letter to Mr. Hervey; as does Mr. F——r in his firſt letter of the Vindication (p. 12); where he ſays, that " though the law
" of the ſpirit of life in Chriſt Jeſus will not deliver them
" from the *innocent infirmities of fleſh and blood*, it will ne-
" vertheleſs make them free from the law of ſin and death."
So likewiſe in many parts of his laſt piece, he ſpeaks of *the*

[N] Upon the queſtion being put home to thoſe who profeſs ſinleſs perfection, " Do you keep the whole law, without offending in
" one point?" Mr. Weſley in his anſwer, dated Dec. 28, 1762, replies, " I believe ſome would anſwer, We truſt we do keep the whole
" law of love." Being aſked again, " Do you defy God himſelf
" to find any ſin in you?" he anſwers, " We humbly hope (pray,
" Reader, mind the word *humbly*) God does not find ſin in us."—
Again, " Do you love God as well as you ought to love him, and
" ſerve him as he ought to be ſerved?" To this Mr. Weſley HUMBLY replies, " I love him with ALL my heart, and ſerve him with ALL
" my ſtrength." But I am ſure if he does this, he had no occaſion to ſoften the moral law, by calling it the law of love, for he fulfils its higheſt demands.

However, though Mr. Weſley flies to evaſions and equivocations, when aſked, " Do you keep the whole law in all its ſpirituality,
" without offending in one point, either in thought, word, or deed?"
yet one of his advocates has printed an anſwer to the Queriſt, dated Feb. 16, 1763, and (properly enough) ſigned ILLITERATE; in which he makes the following reply to the above queſtion: " If
" thou mean the MORAL LAW, I do." (i. e.) *I do keep it in all its ſpirituality, without offending in one point, either in thought, word, or deed.* The ſame Mr. ILLITERATE tells the Queriſt, that he has this teſtimony of himſelf in all things, " *Servant of God, well done;*"
that *he has* " *nothing to do with the law, either in point of juſtifica-*
" *tion or ſanctification.*" He then vindicates Mr. B—l, and others, for declaring they ſhould never die temporally; ſays, " *it remains to*
" *be proved that they are deluded in any, particularly in this point;*"
(i. e. of never dying temporally) and, after having accuſed the Queriſt of an *intimacy with the father of lies*, having called him a *wolf in ſheep's cloathing*, and a *ſecond Herod*, this meek Perfectioniſt *humbly* ſubſcribes himſelf his friend ILLITERATE.

law of Chriſt, as if it were not the ſame with the moral law, particularly (p. 17.) he ſays, St. Paul declares, *not the hearers, but the doers of the law (of Chriſt) ſhall be juſtified*; and (p. 25.) he aſks, "Was not the fulfilling of *the whole law* "*of Chriſt* work enough to juſtify the converted thief by that "law?" Now, the Apoſtle is moſt clearly ſpeaking of the moral law in both theſe places; therefore, what other law Mr. F——r means by *the law of Chriſt*, muſt be left to himſelf to reſolve. However, it is evident enough from whence the doctrine between ſins and *the innocent infirmities of fleſh and blood* is derived, even from the very ſame nauſeous fountain which ſendeth out the muddled waters of a twofold Juſtification, and the denial that we are righteous through the imputation of Chriſt's perſonal righteouſneſs. You will eaſily perceive, Sir, that I mean the Romiſh church, two of whoſe devoted champions, Lindenus and Andradius, (the latter of whom was interpreter to the council of Trent) thus diſtinguiſh between infirmities and ſins, in order to eſtabliſh the doctrine of a ſinleſs perfection in this life.

"The LITTLE TRIFLING FAULTS which are ow-"ing to our daily ſlips and miſtakes, are like ſpecks, or "almoſt imperceptible moles upon the body, which of them-"ſelves do not ſtain or defile; but as it were with ſmall "particles of fine duſt, lightly ſprinkle the Chriſtian life; ſo "that, nevertheleſs, the works of the regenerate may be of "themſelves perfect, and in all reſpects immaculate, even in "this life." *Lindenus.*

"Venial ſins are ſo minute and trivial, that they do not "oppoſe the *perfection of our love*, nor can they hinder our "obedience from being abſolutely perfect." *Andradius.*

And is this the doctrine which is preached to more than 30,000 ſouls, of which Mr. Weſley has the care? Then I am ſure it is high time that not only the Calviniſt miniſters, but all who reverence the ſanctions of the moral law, and wiſh well to the intereſts of Proteſtantiſm, ſhould *in a body proteſt* againſt ſuch licentious Antinomian tenets; which are by far the more dangerous as they come diſguiſed under the ſpecious garb of Chriſtian perfection. Our Lord, jealous to maintain the authority of his own law, ſays, that *whoſoever ſhall break the leaſt of theſe commandments, and ſhall teach men ſo to do, ſhall be called leaſt in the kingdom of Heaven.* And all his faithful ambaſſadors, after the example of their divine maſter, whenever they ſpeak of the law, are careful not to leave the leaſt loop-hole for ſin, by extenuating the rigor and ſpirituality of its requirements, and accommodating it to the frailties

of

of the poor fallen children of men. They know that the law was given as well to convince the unregenerate of ſin, as to be a rule of life to all juſtified believers, and that both of theſe ends muſt be entirely ſuperſeded by talking of *little failures, the innocent infirmities incident to fleſh and blood, trifling breaches of the law, meaner ſins*, and *ſins of ſurprize, which we cannot affirm do or do not bring the ſoul under condemnation.* But let the beſom of Dr. Criſp ſweep away all this Antinomian duſt and rubbiſh, and may it never, never, never riſe again, to the diſhonour of God's law, the diſannulling of the uſe of the goſpel itſelf, and the deluſion of the miſguided 30,000 who ſit under the miniſtry of Mr. Weſley; though many of them I am perſuaded (as well hearers as lay-preachers) are the truly-excellent of the earth, and can ſay with David, "Thou haſt made me "wiſer than my teachers."

Dr. Criſp's words are theſe. "If this ſelf-denial muſt be, "then buckle thyſelf to it, and let it be univerſal, as the "Apoſtle's rule is, to deny all ungodlineſs and worldly luſts. "Be not partial; favour neither SMALL nor great; ſay not "of this, OH, THIS IS BUT A SMALL ONE, or of that, "it does nobody any hurt: but be alike reſolute, caſt out "SMALL and great, quench the SPARKLES as well as the "great coals, the COVERED FIRE as well as the flame; for "a ſpared ſparkle may ſet the whole courſe of nature on fire, "as well as the greateſt coals, and conſume all to aſhes. Say "not, it will go out of itſelf; for the leaſt ſin allowed, or "the allowance of any thing that is againſt the will of Chriſt, "is as a ſparkle lighting upon tender. Such is man's nature "therefore, not likely to go out, but to grow. The very "Gibeonites only being left, and all the reſt of the Canaanites "deſtroyed, prove pricks in the ſides and thorns in the eyes. "One knot of couch-graſs being left in the ground, will ſoon "overgrow, and choak the choice herbs." Dr. Criſp's Serm. vol. II. p. 579.

How zealous was this miniſter of Chriſt, to give the law its due honor, and to eſtabliſh the practice of it in the life and converſation of the believer? He well knew that ſuch doctrine as would undermine the ſpirituality of the law, and ſoften any breach of it into a meer *peccadillo*, ſo far from being of God, contains the very eſſence of that horrid and real Antinomian deluſion of thoſe blind guides, the Scribes and Phariſees of old, which our Lord came down from Heaven to bear his teſtimony againſt in his ſermon upon the mount. And, indeed, it is the very doctrine of the fallen nature, which being totally ignorant of the conſummate holineſs of God, and of the infinite perfection

fection of his law, can neither ſee the real demerit of ſin, nor the juſtice of the law-giver in puniſhing every tranſgreſſion of diſobedience with the curſe.

Again, It is the very doctrine which is preached by all the unconverted clergy of this day, and has been preached by all falſe teachers from the beginning even until now. Search their writings, hear their ſermons, and you ſhall find that they, one and all, talk of a remedial law of grace, and detract from the extent and purity of the moral law (which is the eternal, and only rule of right and wrong) by ſplitting the tranſgreſſion of it into ſlips, failings, infirmities, &c. &c. thereby making thouſands and millions of deluded ſouls perfectly ſatisfied with the ſtate they are in; whilſt, in the eyes of God, they are no better than *whited walls* and *painted ſepulchres*.

Again, It is the very doctrine which the devil himſelf is now preaching to the heart of all unregenerate ſouls, in order to lull them in carnal ſecurity; and not only ſo, but (as I once obſerved upon a former occaſion) our divine poet Milton ſeems clearly of opinion, that it was by this very ſtratagem (of ſoftening the law into infirmities, ſins of ſurprize, &c.) that the old ſerpent firſt beguiled Eve in Paradiſe; for he thus introduces that crafty adverſary accoſting our primæval mother;

——————— "Will God incenſe his ire
"For ſuch a PETTY treſpaſs?"

Though I was juſt going to conclude this letter, yet, rather than leave you again in ſo much bad company, I will beg to uſher in Mr. Weſley once more; eſpecially as you have complained in your Vindication, p. 12, that what he calls *full ſanctification* and *Chriſtian perfection*, *cannot be uſed by him without being made the ſubject of the pious ſneers and godly lampoons of ſome*. Ah, Sir, it is not to be wondered at, that thoſe who acknowledge themſelves to be full of imperfections, and have nothing to ſay upon their own *merit*, ſhould fall into the unhappy method of controverting doctrines by *pious ſneers*, and *godly lampoons*; though I wiſh you had given us ſome proof of your aſſertion. However, in order to ſupport poor Mr. Weſley's ſpirits under the load of all this ill uſage, let us examine if we cannot find ſome *godly lampoons* and *pious ſneers* againſt thoſe who hold with St. Paul and the Church of England, *that, even in the regenerate, the fleſh luſteth againſt the ſpirit, and the ſpirit againſt the fleſh*. And I think the reverend authors of certain hymns and ſacred poems, will ſoon be found victorious over theſe *godly lampooners*, and *pious ſneerers*, and will repay them, with high intereſt, in their own coin.

Soon

Soon as Satan gives the word,
His advocates for ſin
Witneſs with their lying lord,
Ye never can be clean
From all ſin, while here below.
Do not you the word receive;
God's own word will tell you ſo,
But do not you believe (P).

O ye orthodox divines, ye ludicrous verſifiers of awful ſcripture truths, [O] (or to uſe Mr. Charles Weſley's own expreſſion) *Ye bawling witneſſes of perfection,* let me now put your *pious ſneers,* and *godly lampoons* into plain proſe, and the ſenſe of them will be juſt this. "All thoſe miniſters who deny the "doctrine of ſinleſs perfection, (or that believers are not freed "from the very *in-being* of ſin here below) have no other com-"miſſion to preach but what they receive from the devil himſelf, the father of lies, who is their lord and maſter, and they "are advocates for his cauſe." But as you believe Mr. Weſley to be *one of the greateſt miniſters in the world,* and as he has not yet RECANTED the hymns (or, if you pleaſe, the *godly lampoons*), in queſtion, but has publiſhed ſeveral editions of them, what muſt I think of your offers to lend your pulpit, and of your wiſhes to lie at the feet of thoſe miniſters, who, in flat contradiction to the above *ſacred poem,* conſtantly maintain in the apoſtolic language, that even in the moſt advanced Chriſtians, "*the law in the members warreth againſt the law* "*in the mind; and that when they would do good, evil is preſent* "*with them?*" I am ſure if I could adopt Mr. Weſley's creed concerning them, I would as ſoon think of lying at the feet of the devil himſelf, or of lending my pulpit to Simon Magus, as of lying at the feet of theſe *advocates for ſin,* theſe *Satan-ſent miniſters,* theſe *children of the old roaring helliſh murderer, who believe his lie* (Q), leſt I myſelf ſhould partake of their plagues, and leſt my flock ſhould be poiſoned with the heretical deluſions of *their lying lord*; and rather than *go thirty miles to read prayers for them,* I would imitate the example of St. John, who only ſeeing Cerinthus in a public bath with him, immediately left it, and deſired his followers to do the

(O) Hymns and Sacred Poems by the two Mr. Weſleys, vol. II. p. 225, printed at London, 1756.

[P] See Second Check, p. 26.

[Q] An expreſſion borrowed from Mr. Weſley's Hymns on God's everlaſting Love. *Tantæne animis cæleſtibus iræ!*

ſame,

ſame, leſt the building ſhould fall upon their heads. Parker's Abridgment of Euſebius's Eccleſ. Hiſt. p. 72 (R).

Now, my dear Sir, I have given you a little in your own way; but notwithſtanding you have ſet me the example in this manner of writing, I ſhall be glad to ſet you the example of mutual forgiveneſs. By cutting and ſlaſhing we ſhall never convince each other of our errors; and the end of our controverſy will be, that the world will laugh at you for taking the ſword of banter, the ſhield of perverſion, the helmet of prejudice, and the breaſt-plate of acrimony, in order to fight for the doctrine of ſinleſs perfection; and I myſelf ſhall be laughed at in my turn for loſing ſo much precious time in anſwering you.

I am, Reverend Sir,
Your ſincere Wellwiſher, &c.
The Author of P. O.

Let me add the following queries to Mr. Weſley himſelf, by way of Poſtſcript to this letter.

P. S. Did not you, Sir, in adminiſtering the ſacrament a few years ago to a Perfect Society in Weſt-ſtreet chapel, leave the confeſſion of ſin out of the communion ſervice: no doubt, as ill ſuiting ſo angelic a company?

Did not one of the enthuſiaſts, then preſent, get up and ſay, "He had heard a voice whilſt he was at prayer tell him, *he was all holineſs to the Lord?*"

Did not a ſecond declare the ſame thing?

Did not G——e B——l then ſay, "That he walked with "God as did Enoch, and ſhould never die?"

Did not ſome one preſent reply, "I think what brother B—l "ſays is very true; for Chriſt declares, *whoſoever liveth and be-"lieveth in him ſhall never die?*" To this you very properly objected; and declared in confutation of it, that though ſiſter [ſomebody] believed in Chriſt, ſhe died on Wedneſday laſt.

After all this, did not another perfect brother get up and ſay, "He believed we were very near the Millenium, *for there "had been more conſtables ſworn in that year than heretofore?*"

[R] Mr. Weſley has given us this anecdote in his Chriſtian Library, vol. II. p. 241. His words are theſe:

"St. John going at Epheſus to be waſhed, and ſeeing Cerinthus "in the bath, leaped out, becauſe he feared the bath ſhould have "fallen, ſeeing ſuch an enemy to the truth was within. Such fear "had the Apoſtles, (ſaith Irenæus) that they would not exchange a "word with them that adulterate the truth."

This

This I have put down *verbatim* from the mouth of a judicious Chriſtian friend who was then preſent; but from that time has been heartily ſick of ſinleſs perfection.

Again, Do not you know a clergyman, once cloſely connected with you, who refuſed a great witneſs for perfection the ſacrament, becauſe he had been detected in bed with a perfect ſiſter? And did not he urge in his behalf, that he did it to try *whether all evil deſire was taken away.*

Once more, Did not you, Sir, a few years ago preach a ſermon in defence of the imputed Righteouſneſs of Chriſt in Weſt-ſtreet chapel; and afterwards (when the congregation was diſmiſſed) bid the ſociety who ſtaid, BEWARE OF THAT SMOOTH DOCTRINE OF IMPUTED RIGHTEOUSNESS? [This anecdote was alſo told me by a perſon of undoubted reputation and piety, who heard you ſay the words, and to whom I will accompany you if you deny them.] Upon which my relator, who was much attached to you before, was ſo ſtruck as to be hardly able to refrain ſpeaking to you in the chapel; and, from that hour, gave up all connections with you.

Now, Sir, as there is a poſſibility of interpreting even this conduct of yours in a favourable manner, I will, by all means, put the moſt candid conſtruction upon your words. I hope your meaning was, that although you had been holding forth the imputed Righteouſneſs of Chriſt as the only foundation of a ſinner's hope, to a mixed multitude or congregation (for that expreſſion you alſo made uſe of) yet you thought it right to caution your ſociety, very particularly, how they abuſed that doctrine of imputed righteouſneſs, which to ſome, who turned it into licentiouſneſs, was a *ſmooth doctrine* of which they ought to beware. However, it is certain your words ſtruck my friend, who gave me this account, in quite another light; viz. as the effect of great inconſiſtency and duplicity of conduct in you; and, therefore, this circumſtance has been the means of a ſeparation from you ever ſince.

Laſtly, Did not you, Sir, in a ſermon preached at *Aſhby de la Zouch*, on Friday, March 20, 1772, uſe nearly theſe words: "Take heed; mark what I am going to ſay; I know ſome of "you will wonder, but let this ſtand as an undeniable truth "with you, that as the heavens are above the earth, ſo is the "law (and much more) above the goſpel." But if this be ſo, St. Paul muſt have been under a grievous miſtake, when he ſaid, *If the miniſtration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the miniſtration of righteouſneſs exceed in glory*, 2 Cor. 3, 9; and ſurely the poor deluded evangeliſt ought to have tranſpoſed his words, John i. 17, and ſhould have ſaid, *The law was given by Jeſus Chriſt, but grace and truth came by Moſes.*

LETTER IV.

REVEREND SIR,

WHOSOEVER has given your book but a curſory peruſal, muſt have perceived that the grand fortreſs againſt which all your artillery is played, and at which your heavy bombs of bitter ſneer and cutting ſarcaſm are thrown, is, THE FINISHED SALVATION OF CHRIST. *This is the expreſſion in which all Antinomianiſm centers; this the ſtalking-horſe* [S] *of every wild ranter; this is the ſmooth Syren-ſong which has deluded thouſands* upon earth, and which will be made the faultering plea of damned ſpirits at the day of judg-

[S] I beg leave to hint to my friend Mr. F——r, that the *Trojan horſe* of *Arminianiſm* has ever been eſteemed among *real Proteſtants* to be full as dangerous as the *ſtalking-horſe* of *finiſhed ſalvation*. A proof of this aſſertion may be gathered from Mr. Rous's ſpeech in the houſe of Commons, an. 1628. His words are as follow: "I deſire "that we may conſider the increaſe of Arminianiſm; an error that "makes the grace of God lackey it after the will of man; that "makes the ſheep to keep the ſhepherd, and makes a mortal ſeed "ſpring from an immortal God. I deſire we may look into the "very belly and bowels of this TROJAN HORSE, to ſee if there be "not men in it ready to open the gates to Romiſh tyranny and Spa-"niſh monarchy.——An Arminian is the ſpawn of a Papiſt." Ruſhworth's Collections, vol. I. p. 645.

I own I think the expreſſion rather harſh, that "an Arminian is the "ſpawn of a Papiſt;" and yet it is very certain, that the Papiſts have always rejoiced at the progreſs of Arminianiſm, as what was moſt likely to promote their cauſe. Witneſs the Jeſuit's letter ſent to the rector at Bruſſels in the reign of Charles the firſt, wherein are the following words; "We have planted the ſovereign drug Armi-"nianiſm, which we hope will purge the Proteſtants from their "hereſy." Again, "I am at this time tranſported with joy to ſee "how happily all inſtruments and means co-operate unto our pur-"poſes. But *our foundation is Arminianiſm.*"

A copy of this letter was found among the papers of a neſt of prieſts and Jeſuits at Clerkenwell.

ment.

ment. Yet this very expreſſion, in it's full extent, I undertake to vindicate; and, in ſo doing, ſhall fly to no other arſenal for my weapons but that of eternal truth itſelf. I will take the ſword of the Spirit, which is the word of God; and the Lord enabling me to wield it aright, I doubt not but I ſhall *put to flight the armies of the aliens.*

I have obſerved in a former piece, that when the Lord of glory bowed his head upon the croſs, and gave up the ghoſt, he cried, *It is finiſhed.* And what was finiſhed? Not merely his life; but *the work which was given him to do.* And what was this work, but the ſalvation of his people?——One would have imagined, that our Lord's own uſe of this expreſſion might have ſilenced every cavil which could be raiſed againſt it. But not ſo. Mr. F——r ſtill objects, "If the ſalvation of the elect was finiſhed upon the croſs, then was their juſtification finiſhed, their ſanctification finiſhed, their glorification finiſhed; for juſtification, ſanctification, and glorification finiſhed, are but the various parts of our finiſhed ſalvation." P. 81.

Now as all events are preſent unto God, and were ſo from eternity to eternity; ſo when there is a certainty of their accompliſhment, he frequently calls things that are not as though they were; and hence it is that St. Paul actually repreſents the glorification of the elect to be as much *finiſhed* as their predeſtination: for, ſaith he, Rom. viii. 29, *Whom he did predeſtinate, them he alſo called; and whom he called, them he alſo juſtified; and whom he juſtified, them he alſo glorified.*

The ſame Apoſtle, in his Epiſtle to the Epheſians, ſpeaking to believers who were juſt called out of darkneſs into marvellous light, yet addreſſes them as already (virtually) *ſeated in heavenly places in Chriſt Jeſus*; and *that* for this plain reaſon, becauſe Chriſt and his Church are always repreſented as one; and where the head is, there the members muſt be alſo, foraſmuch as they are *bone of his bone, and fleſh of his fleſh.* For the ſame reaſon are they ſaid to be *quickened with Chriſt, dead with him, buried with him, raiſed together with him*; and *becauſe he liveth, they ſhall live alſo*, being *kept by the power of God through faith unto ſalvation.*

But does not this ſuperſede the neceſſity of watchfulneſs and mortification of ſin? Juſt the very reverſe. For it is a principal part of Chriſt's *finiſhed ſalvation*, that he has purchaſed the ſpirit to work theſe graces in the hearts of his children; and, in this reſpect, (viz. as a matter which ſhall infallibly take place) their ſanctification is really as much *finiſhed* as their juſtification; the one is not the work of Chriſt, and the other

left to themſelves; but both the one, and the other, are equally provided for in that *everlaſting covenant which is ordered in all things and ſure.*

Again, *Salvation is finiſhed*, in that it is made as ſure to all the ſeed as the oath and promiſe of an immutable God can mak it. Now, even *to men* (as ſaith the Apoſtle, Heb. vi. 16, &c.) *an oath for confirmation is an end of all ſtrife. Wherefore God, willing more abundantly to ſhew unto the heirs of promiſe the immutability of his counſel, confirmed it by an oath, that, by two immutable things, in which it was impoſſible for God to lie, we might have a ſtrong conſolation who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope ſet before us.* Now, let it be ſuppoſed that I had an eſtate left me by the laſt will and teſtament of ſome near and dear friend; that the perſon who left it had an undoubted right and power to make the bequeſt. Let it be further ſuppoſed, that I knew this will and teſtament to be ſigned, ſealed, and properly atteſted; might I not reaſonably look upon myſelf as ſure of the inheritance as if I already enjoyed it: might I not juſtly ſay, "*the whole affair is finiſhed*; "there remains nothing for me to do, but to take poſſeſſion?" Inaſmuch, therefore, as *all the promiſes of God are Yea and Amen in Chriſt Jeſus*; inaſmuch as the inheritance is not only bequeathed by Chriſt himſelf, but ratified, ſigned, and ſealed by his own moſt precious blood; certain it is, that the ſalvation of every ſoul given by the Father to the Son in the eternal covenant of redemption, is as firmly ſecured, as if thoſe ſouls were now in glory: and, therefore, to ſcruple the uſe of that expreſſion, *finiſhed ſalvation*, argues at once the greateſt miſtruſt of the Mediator's power, and caſts the higheſt reflection upon his infinite wiſdom, by ſuppoſing that he did not count the coſt before he began to build; and, therefore, that either his own perſonal work, or that which he does in his members, (for they are only parts of the ſame ſalvation) is left *unfiniſhed*.

But if this were the caſe, he himſelf would never have ſaid, *He that believeth hath everlaſting life*; not *ſhall* have, but *now hath* everlaſting life; it is already begun in the ſoul, and is ſo certain in reverſion that nothing ſhall deprive him of it.—— Again, The beloved diſciple ſaith, under the glorious views which he had of a *finiſhed ſalvation*, *Theſe things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God, that ye may know that* YE HAVE *eternal life.* And the choſen veſſel Paul tells his beloved Timothy, that *God* HATH *ſaved us, and called us with an holy calling; not according to our works, but according to his own purpoſe and grace, which was given us in Chriſt Jeſus before the world began.*

But

But farther. Believers are ſaid to *be ſaved by faith*, and to be *kept by the power of God through faith unto ſalvation.* Now true faith and ſalvation being here inſeparably linked by the Apoſtle, and Chriſt being ſtyled, not only *the author*, but THE FINISHER *of our faith*, he muſt be, conſequently, *the finiſher of our ſalvation*; and, therefore, every Chriſtian miniſter ought to glory in holding him forth as ſuch.

Now I appeal to any candid judges, whether I have not brought ſufficient authority, from the beſt of all authorities, God's unerring word, for the uſe of that phraſe *finiſhed ſalvation?* And that you may not think I am for referring the matter to ſuch as would be partial to my ſide of the queſtion, I make choice of the two Mr. Weſleys to determine the controverſy between us. If theſe gentlemen declare, that the expreſſion is dangerous and heterodox, I chearfully ſubmit to their deciſion; but I think I have them both in my favour. However, let us examine.

Mr. Hervey, in the ſecond and third of his eleven letters, brings the following lines from Mr. Weſley's hymns. As Mr. Hervey was a very accurate writer, I doubt not but the quotations are juſt; therefore ſhall not ſearch for them any farther.

For every man,
IT'S FINISH'D, it's paſt.
The world is forgiven [S]
For Jeſus's ſake.

Again,

Let us for this faith contend;
Sure Salvation is it's end.
Heaven already is begun,
Everlaſting life is won.

If this verſe does not preclude all, and more than all, the objections you have raiſed again a *finiſhed ſalvation*, there is no meaning in words. If, therefore, Mr. Weſley can ſing this *Syren-ſong*, that *everlaſting life is already won*, I am ſure he will be much diſpleaſed that Mr. F——r ſhould call *finiſhed ſalvation* "THE STALKING-HORSE OF EVERY WILD "RANTER."

[S] Mr. Hervey obſerves upon this expreſſion, that Mr. Weſley muſt here mean the whole world of Believers, or the elect world; otherwiſe, to ſay that the whole world in general (including both believers and unbelievers) is forgiven, carries with it a notorious untruth.

In

In a volume of hymns and ſacred poems by Meſſrs. J. and C. Weſley, I find the two following lines taken from the excellent Dr. Watts:

Love's redeeming work IS DONE,
Fought the fight, the battle won!

Now, where is the difference between *redemption* from the guilt and dominion of ſin, and *ſalvation* from theſe? And where the difference between being *done* and being *finiſhed?*

In the ſame volume is the following ſtanza:

Jeſus, the Lamb of God, hath bled;
He bore our ſins upon the tree;
Beneath our curſe he bow'd his head:
'TIS FINISH'D! He hath died for me.

The under written excellent doxology is alſo uſually attributed to Mr. Charles Weſley; but if it be not his, I ſhall be very willing to give up the uſe I make of it, as I have quite ammunition enough without it from the two reverend divines I have called in to be my allies againſt all ſuch as would deprive the church of that truly ſcriptural expreſſion, THE FINISHED SALVATION OF CHRIST.

The Father bleſs, the Son adore,
The Spirit praiſe for evermore;
SALVATION'S GLORIOUS WORK IS DONE,
We welcome thee, great Three in One.

What the two Mr. Weſleys have jointly advanced in behalf of *finiſhed Salvation* in verſe, Mr. John has thoroughly eſtabliſhed in proſe: for, in his Chriſtian Library, which, he tells us in the preface, (he believes to be *all true, all agreeable to the word of God*), he ſays, "Chriſt carried on the great work of my "*ſalvation*, being himſelf both the author and *finiſher* of it." And how this was done, he thus explains;—"While Chriſt "was on the earth, he FINISHED that work which was "committed to him to FINISH here, having purchaſed all "that was to be bought by his blood, paying all the price "that juſtice did aſk; by which price, he hath purchaſed a "people to himſelf; ſo that his work, cauſe and intereſt, is "a purchaſed work; *bought with blood.*

"The Father ſtandeth engaged to make good to him all "that was promiſed, and to give him all that he purchaſed. "Chriſt, having now fulfilled his undertaking, by making his "ſoul an offering for ſin, and ſo ſatisfying juſtice, which is "openly declared by his reſurrection and admiſſion to glory, "is to expect the accompliſhment of what was conditioned

"unto

" unto him. His work, therefore, on the earth *muſt* proſper,
" and the Father hath undertaken to ſee it proſper."

" Chriſt himſelf it now thoroughly furniſhed and enabled
" for the carrying on of his work, over the belly of all ad-
" verſaries; for, *all power in heaven and earth is given to him.*
" *Every knee muſt bow to him. All judgment is committed*
" *unto him. Angels, powers, and authority are made ſubject*
" *unto him:* yea, *all things are under him.* How then can
" his work miſcarry?

" Chriſt is actually at work, employing his power for the
" carrying forward his deſign, for the glory of the Father,
" and for his own glory, and for the good of his poor people.
" The Father worketh by him, and he by the ſpirit, who is
" his great vicegerent, ſent from the Father and from him;
" and his work is to glorify the Son; and he ſhall receive of
" his, and ſhew it unto us.

" Chriſt, upon many accounts, ſtandeth engaged to PER-
" FECT this work which he hath begun, and is about. His
" honour is engaged to go through, ſeeing he is now fully
" furniſhed for it, and hath all the creation at his command.
" He MUST then PERFECT his work as to the *application*,
" as well as he DID PERFECT it as to the *purchaſe*. His
" love to his Father's and his own glory, and to his own
" peoples good and ſalvation, may aſſure us, that *he will not*
" *leave the work unperfected*; and his power may give us
" full ſecurity, that no ſtop which his work meeteth with
" ſhall be able to hinder it.

" This is an undoubted truth, which, if firmly believed,
" would do much to ſettle our ſtaggering ſouls in a ſtormy
" day." Mr. Weſley's Chriſtian Library, vol. XXXVI.
p. 123, 124, 125.

Theſe, Sir, are exactly my ſentiments relative to Finiſhed Salvation; theſe are the ſentiments of Mr. Weſley, and the ſentiments of all Calviniſts that I am acquainted with. On theſe bleſſed truths I build all my ſalvation; and hope, living and dying, to be found in the experimental poſſeſſion of them. If you have any objection to them, I refer you to Mr. Weſley; and remain,

Reverend Sir,

Your ſincere Friend and Well-wiſher,

The Author of P. O.

LETTER V.

REVEREND SIR,

SO far as you have borne your teſtimony againſt real Antinomianiſm, you have done well; ſo far as you have endeavoured to rouſe religious profeſſors out of their Laodicean lukewarmneſs, you are entitled to the thanks of every ſincere Chriſtian: But, ſo far as you have defended your cauſe with improper weapons, eſpecially ſo far as you have traduced all the moſt celebrated miniſters of the goſpel in this day, and thereby thrown ſtumbling-blocks into the way of thouſands, you have done very ill. Indeed, Sir, if any indifferent perſon were to read, and to credit the accounts you give of the doctrine of the *celebrated preachers of free-grace* in this day, and of the ſtate of their congregations, if he had the leaſt regard for the welfare of his own ſoul, he would flee from every church and place where any ſuch preacher ſtood up, as he would flee from *the noiſome peſtilence*, or even *from the wrath to come*. And with good reaſon too; ſince what theſe preachers conſtantly affirm to be the whole foundation of a ſinner's acceptance, you repeatedly make the language of a damned ſoul at the day of judgment; and, O ſhocking to tell! even this awful ſcene cannot be introduced by you, without doing it in the ſame wretched ſpirit of low ſarcaſm and ſlanderous banter, which runs throughout your whole book. For God's ſake, Sir, conſider what you have done. Is damnation ſo trivial a thing, ſo light a matter, that you can even ſneer at the woe of thoſe on whom it is inflicted? Conſider again what thoſe expreſſions are, which you have put into the mouths of your ſuppoſed Antinomian reprobates; many of them the very words of ſcripture, and others containing the plea of the moſt eminent ſaints that ever lived. But I chooſe to tranſcribe your own words, only making ſome marginal notes and obſervations upon them.—The ſcene is the day of judgment; and what is ſpoken contains the reply of a damned

ſpirit,

ſpirit, to whom the Redeemer has juſt ſaid, "*Depart, ye "curſed.*" The trembling ſoul anſwers,

"Lord, when ſaw we thee hungry, or a-thirſt, or a "ſtranger, or naked, or ſick, or in priſon, and did not mi- "niſter to thee? Had we ſeen thee, dear Lord, in any di- "ſtreſs, how gladly would we have relieved thy wants! "Numbers can witneſs how well we ſpoke of thee, and thy "righteouſneſs; it was all our boaſt. Bring it out in this "important hour. Hide not the goſpel of thy free grace. "We always delighted in pure doctrine, in "ſalvation with- "out any condition, eſpecially *without the condition of* "*works* [R]." Stand, gracious Lord, ſtand by us, and the "preachers of thy free grace [S], who made us hope thou "wouldſt confirm their words."

"While they taught us to call thee Lord, Lord, they "aſſured us, that *love would conſtrain us to do good works* [T]; "but finding no inward conſtraint to entertain ſtrangers, "viſit the ſick, and relieve priſoners, we did it not, ſuppoſ- "ing we were not called thereto [U]. They continually told "us, "human righteouſneſs was mere filth before thee; and "we could not appear but to our everlaſting ſhame in any "righteouſneſs but thine in the day of judgment [X]." As to

---

[R] That the reverend Mr. Weſley alſo once greatly delighted in this doctrine, is clear from the following quotation out of his own Journals.—"I believe no works can be previous to Juſtification, *nor* "*conſequently a condition of it.*"

[S] Here the preachers of free grace are all introduced as ſtanding at the left hand; and, as blind leaders of the blind, are to ſuffer the doom of thoſe they have deceived, by *making them believe that God would confirm their word.* Heaven forbid that Mr. F——r ſhould again offer his pulpit to ſuch miniſters, or talk any more of lying in the duſt at their feet!

[T] Another ſneer at the very words of St. Paul.

[U] Did ever any of our eminent free-grace preachers ſuppoſe or aſſert any ſuch thing. I declare I know none of them, but, after having laid the foundation in faith, raiſe the ſuperſtructure in good works; therefore this is again vile ſlander.

[X] Here is not only the language, but almoſt the very words of Iſaiah and St. Paul, ſneeringly put into the mouth of a damned ſoul. The words of the prophet are, *All our righteouſneſſes are as filthy rags.* Thoſe of the Apoſtle, *I count all things but dung, that I may be found in Chriſt, not having my own righteouſneſs, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Chriſt, the righteouſneſs which is of God by faith.*

" works, we were afraid of doing them, leſt we ſhould have " worked out abominations inſtead of our ſalvation [Y]."

" And indeed, Lord, what need was there of our working " it out? For they perpetually aſſured us it was finiſhed; " ſaying, if we did any thing towards it, we worked for life, " fell from grace like the bewitched Galatians, ſpoiled thy " perfect work, and expoſed ourſelves to the deſtruction which " awaits yonder trembling Phariſees."

" They likewiſe aſſured us, that all depended on thy de- " crees; and if we could but firmly believe our election, it " was a ſure ſign we were intereſted in thy ſalvation [Z]. We

---

[Y] Shocking ſlander again! And this will be the burden of my complaint till you confirm your charges againſt the preachers of finiſhed ſalvation. O, Sir, with what an ill grace do you find fault with others for cenſuring miniſters, when you yourſelf do the ſame thing in ſo notorious a manner? Surely the Apoſtle's reaſoning, Rom. ii. 1, 2, 3, is but too applicable to you in this particular. However, I dare not blame you for the warmth of your expreſſions (p. 63, 64) againſt the inſolence of *hearers* for judging *preachers*; and heartily wiſh you could make Mr. Weſley's perfectioniſts to profit by them, and to refrain writing their impertinent letters to Mr. R——e, Mr. M——n, &c. when theſe gentlemen do not preach ſo as to *pleaſe their Arminian palates*; but I am ſorry to ſay, that ever ſince the firſt edition of this book was publiſhed, I have ſeen full proof of the inefficacy of your labors in this reſpect from a great ſtickler for perfection. And indeed it is no longer ſince than laſt Sunday, that a note was thrown into Mr. Madan's pew at the Lock-Chapel to the following effect: " The prayers of God's people are deſired that he may deſtroy " all Predeſtinarians, particularly Peircy and Toplady." And a ſhort while before, another paper was thrown into the ſame pew, wherein Mr. Peircy, in plain terms, was called a *lyar*, &c. Anecdotes theſe which I confeſs prove nothing at all, and which I would not have mentioned, had not you, Sir, obliged me to it by talking of the inſolence of hearers in judging the preachers of your ſentiments.

[Z] You muſt be very ſenſible, Sir, that every Calviniſt miniſter, ſo far from telling their hearers, that " If they can but firmly be- " lieve their election, it is a ſure ſign of their being intereſted in the " ſalvation of Chriſt," always tell them to prove their election by their converſion or calling. Why do you not bring ſome quotations from their ſermons, or writings, in order to confirm theſe heavy charges? Do this, and we ſhall have no cauſe to complain of your moſt unkind treatment. But you have managed the matter ſo very artfully, that whilſt every one of your readers can ſee as plainly as you could wiſh, who they are that the ſnake has bitten, the ſnake itſelf lies ſo hidden in the graſs, that it is not very eaſy to catch hold of it.

" did

" did ſo; and now, Lord, for want of a few dung-works
" we have omitted, let not our hope periſh! Let not electing
" and everlaſting love fail! Viſit our offences with a rod,
" but take not thy loving kindneſs altogether from us; and
" break not David's covenant, ordered in all things and ſure,
" of which we have ſo often made our boaſt [A]."

" May it pleaſe thee alſo to conſider, that if we did not
" love and aſſiſt ſome of thoſe whom thou calleſt thy brethren,
" it was becauſe they appeared unto us ſo exceedingly legal,
" ſo ſtrongly ſet againſt free grace, that we judged them to
" be obſtinate Phariſees, and dangerous reprobates; we there-
" fore thought, that in hating and oppoſing them we did thee
" ſervice, and walked in thy ſteps. For thou haſt ſaid, it is
" enough if the ſervant is as his Lord; and ſuppoſing thou
" didſt hate them, as thou doſt Satan, we thought we need
" not be more righteous than thou, by loving them more
" than thou didſt [B]."

" O ſuffer us to ſpeak on and tell thee, we were cham-
" pions for thy free grace; like true Proteſtants, we could
" have burned againſt the doctrine of a ſecond Juſtification
" by works. Let then grace *juſtify us freely without works* [C].
" Shut thoſe books filled with the account of our deeds;
" open the arms of thy mercy, and receive us juſt as we are."

" If free grace cannot juſtify us alone, let faith do it, to-
" gether with free grace: We do believe *finiſhed ſalvation*,
" Lord; we can join in the moſt evangelical creeds, and are
" ready to confeſs the virtue of thy atoning blood: But if
" thou ſayeſt, we have trampled it under foot, and made it a
" common thing, grant us our laſt requeſt, and it is enough."

" [D] Cut out the immaculate garment of thy righteouſneſs
" into robes that may fit us all, and put them upon us by
imputation;

[A] Another ſneer, almoſt in the very words of ſcripture.

[B] Abominable beyond all the reſt—I dare ſay you cannot produce any one inſtance of a Calviniſt who refuſed to aſſiſt a needy brother becauſe he was legal, and not clear in the goſpel.

[C] Another ſneer in the Apoſtle's own words.

[D] What follows in the four or five next Paragraphs is all of the ſame ſtamp; containing nothing but bitter and low ſneers, levelled (at leaſt indirectly) at the doctrine of imputed righteouſneſs, in order to make it appear ridiculous in the eyes of the reader. And I muſt do the reverend Author the juſtice to ſay, that he has ſucceeded in his attempts, by bringing up ſuch a confuſed heap of abſurdities, as I believe no man ever thought of before, and putting them into the

" imputation; ſo ſhall our nakedneſs be glorioufly covered. " We confeſs we have not dealt our bread to the hungry, but " impute to us thy feeding 5000 people with loaves and " fiſhes. We have ſeldom given drink to the thirſty, and " often put our bottle to thoſe who were not a-thirſt; but " impute to us thy turning water into wine, to refreſh the " gueſts at the marriage-feaſt in Canaan, and thy loud call in " the laſt day of the feaſt of Jeruſalem, If any man thirſt, let " him come to me and drink. We never ſuppoſed it was " our duty to be given to hoſpitality; but impute to us thy " loving invitations to ſtrangers; thy kind aſſurances of re- " ceiving all that come to thee; thy comfortable promiſes of " caſting out none, and with feeding them even with thy " fleſh and blood. We did not clothe the naked as we had " opportunity and ability; impute to us thy parting with thy " ſeamleſs garment, for the benefit of thy murderers. We " did not viſit ſick-beds and priſons, we were afraid of fevers, " and eſpecially of the jail diſtemper; but impute to us thy " viſiting Jairus's daughter, and Peter's wife's mother, who lay " ſick of a fever; and put to our account thy viſiting putrefy- " ing Lazarus in the offenſive priſon of the grave."

" Thy imputed righteouſneſs, Lord, can alone anſwer all " the demands of thy law and goſpel. We did not dare to " faſt; we ſhould have been called legal and Papiſts if we " had [E]; but thy forty days faſting in the wilderneſs, and " thy continual abſtinence imputed to us, will be ſelf-denial " enough to juſtify us ten times over. We did not take up " our croſs; but impute to us thy carrying thine; and even " fainting under the oppreſſive load. We did not mortify " the deeds of the fleſh, that we might live." This would " have been evidently " working for life," but impute to us " the crucifixion of thy body, inſtead of our crucifying our fleſh, " with its affections and luſts. We hated private prayer; but

---

mouths of thoſe whom he ſends without mercy to Hell for pleading *imputed righteouſneſs, free grace, and imputed ſalvation.* And indeed poor David himſelf ſeems (according to the Vindicator) to be but in evil caſe; for that very thing which he avows to be *all his ſalvation and all his deſire,* even that *everlaſting covenant which is ordered in all things and ſure,* is here made the vain plea of a reprobate; as is alſo that ſelf-abaſing, but Chriſt-exalting expreſſion of the ſame eminent ſaint, *I will make mention of thy righteouſneſs, even of thine only.*

[E] However, I know ſeveral miniſters who preach *imputed righteouſneſs,* that have faſted ſo rigorouſly as thereby to injure their health.

" impute

" impute to us thy love of that duty, and the prayer thou didſt " offer up upon a mountain all night. We have been rather " hard to forgive; but that defect will be abundantly made " up, if thou imputeſt unto us thy forgiving of the dying " thief: and if that will not do, add, we beſeech thee, the " merit of that good ſaying of thine, Forgive, and you ſhall " be forgiven. We have cheated the king of his cuſtoms; " but no matter; only impute to us thy exact paying of the " tribute-money, together with thy good advice, Render unto " Cæſar the things which are Cæſar's."

" It is true, we have brought up our children in vanity, " and thou never hadſt any to bring up; may not thy mercy " find out an expedient, and impute to us, inſtead of it, thy " obedience to thy parents? And if we have received the ſa- " crament unworthily, and thou canſt not cover that ſin with " thy worthy receiving, indulge us with the imputation of thy " worthy inſtitution of it, and that will do yet better."

" In ſhort, Lord, own us freely as thy children; impute to " us thy perfect righteouſneſs; caſt it as a cloke upon us, to " cover our filthy ſouls, and polluted bodies. *We will have* " *no righteouſneſs but thine.* Make no mention, we beſeech " thee, of our righteouſneſs and perſonal holineſs; they are " but filthy rags, which thy purity forbids thee to take into " Heaven; therefore, accept us without, and we ſhall ſhout " free grace, imputed righteouſneſs, and finiſhed ſalvation, to " eternity."

" While the bold Antinomian offers, or prepares to offer " *this moſt impious plea* [F], the Lord, who is of purer eyes " than to behold the leaſt iniquity, caſts a flaming look upon " all the obſtinate violators of his law. It pierces their con- " ſcience, rouſes all its drowſy powers, and reſtores their " memory to its original perfection. Not one wiſh paſſed their " heart, or thought their brain, but is inſtantly brought to " their remembrance; the books are opened in their own " breaſt, and every character has a voice which anſwers to the " voice of the lion of the tribe of Judah.

" Shall I pervert judgment, ſays he, and juſtify the wicked " for a bribe? The bribe of your abominable praiſes? Think " you, by your baſe flatteries, to eſcape the righteous judg- " ment of God? Is not all my wrath revealed from Heaven " againſt all ungodlineſs and unrighteouſneſs of men, who

---

[F] Here, *horreſco referens!* the doctrines of free grace, imputed righteouſneſs, and finiſhed ſalvation, are called a moſt impious plea.

" hold

" hold the truth in unrighteouſneſs? Much more againſt you, " ye veſſels of wrath, who hold an impious abſurdity, in " matchleſs inſolence." " Said I not to Cain himſelf, at the " beginning, If thou doeſt well ſhalt thou not be accepted? " Perſonal holineſs, which ye ſcorned, is the wedding gar- " ment [G] I now look for. I ſwear in my wrath, that with- " out it, none ſhall taſte of my heavenly ſupper. Ye reject " my word and commandment, and I reject you from being " kings: Ye cried unto me, and I delivered you: Yet have " ye forſaken me and followed other gods, therefore, I will " deliver you no more: Go, and cry unto the gods whom ye " have choſen. I wound the hairy ſcalp of ſuch as have gone " on ſtill in their wickedneſs. Whoſoever have ſinned againſt " me to the laſt, him do I blot out of my book: And this " you have done, ye ſerpents, ye generation of vipers! Awake " to everlaſting ſhame!"

THAT you might *ſhoot out your arrows, even bitter words*, with the greater ſecurity, you tell us (p. 64), that you firſt level them at yourſelf; that you will not be partial; that you will confeſs your ſin, and that of many of your brethren.

But when you come to the confeſſion itſelf, then your *partiality* ſhews itſelf; your own ſin is entirely omitted, and that which, in your idea, is the ſin of your brethren, alone is mentioned. For inſtance, You expreſs great diſſatisfaction, that the doctrines of *free will*, *ſinleſs perfection*, and *ſecond juſtification by works*, are exploded in our *celebrated pulpits*. But how are you to blame here; ſince you mainly contend for

---

[G] This point does not yet ſeem to be properly ſettled between Mr. F——r and Mr. Weſley; nor indeed, between Mr. Weſley when he writes to Mr. Hervey, and Mr. Weſley when he comments on the New Teſtament; for in his letter to Mr. Hervey, he ſays expreſsly, that, *The wedding garment means* HOLINESS. But, in his notes on the New Teſtament, he tells us, that, *The wedding garment is the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, firſt imputed, then implanted.* Had he ſtopped at the word *imputed*, (for there are not two wedding garments) though he would ſtill have manifeſted his inconſiſtency with himſelf, yet he would have given us the true explanation of our Lord's words. I might here alſo make ſome remarks on Mr. Weſley's inconſiſtency with himſelf, in ſo material a point of doctrine; but I expect that his Vindicator would tell me in anſwer, that Mr. Weſley is only acting like a ſkilful phyſician, who adminiſters different medicines to his patient, by ſometimes making this wedding garment to be the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, ſometimes our own inherent holineſs.

theſe

theſe tenets, both from the pulpit and the preſs; and mainly cry out againſt the oppoſite doctrines, as *bound will*, *Antinomianiſm*, *Criſpianity*, *Ranteriſm*, and what not? It is therefore too plain, that your introduction of your own name, as bearing a part in this univerſal Antinomian corruption, is as much without any deſign of bringing yourſelf under the laſh, as the fowler is without deſign of wounding himſelf, when he points his piece at the bird marked out for deſtruction.

Again, Do you reckon yourſelf among the number of thoſe free-grace preachers, who, (as you tell us) repreſent *God's commandments as the needleſs and impracticable ſanctions of that ſuperannuated legaliſt Moſes*; who put *Dr. Criſp's coat upon the Apoſtle*; who *villify the moral law, and make it contemptible*; who repreſent it as *an intolerable yoke of bondage, and dreſs it up as a ſcarecrow*; who, *under pretence of drawing their hearers by love, ſoftly rock the cradle of carnal ſecurity in which they ſleep*, and *ſing the ſyren-ſong of finiſhed ſalvation?* Again, Do you rank yourſelf among the number of thoſe preachers who chooſe comfortable ſubjects to pleaſe their hearers; and who (being unwilling to *loſe your reputation as an evangelical preacher*), *dare not preach upon ſome important ſcriptures, unleſs it be to explain away or enervate their meaning*; who *ſelect ſmooth texts in order to gratify an Antinomian audience* [H]; who *help*

[H] Mr. F——r, p. 61, 62, ſays, "It is a doubt whether we could preach in ſome celebrated pulpits on *the good man who is merciful and lendeth*, &c. &c. &c. *without giving general diſguſt; unleſs, to keep in the good grace of our Nicolaitan hearers, we were to diſſent from all ſober commentators, by putting a wrong interpretation upon ſuch texts*;" and, with one of his uſual ſneers at our *evangelical congregations*, ſays we may open our ſervice with the following words: "When the wicked man turneth away from his wickedneſs, and "doeth that which is lawful and right, he ſhall ſave his ſoul alive: "but woe unto us, if we handle that ſcripture in the pulpit, unleſs we "wreſt it [I almoſt tremble to write what follows] by repreſenting "Chriſt as the wicked man, who does that which is lawful and right, "to ſave our ſouls alive, without any of our doings."

For the full confutation of this baſe ſlander, I ſhall produce the heads of a diſcourſe on this very text, preached in one of the moſt *celebrated pulpits*, and by one of the moſt ſtrenuous *free grace orthodox miniſters* of the preſent century; though, alas! in Mr. Weſley's eſteem, one whoſe doctrine of *finiſhed ſalvation* and *imputed righteouſneſs* tended to throw wide open the flood-gates of Antinomian licentiouſneſs; and therefore he addreſſes him, without ceremony, with, "O ſyren-ſong!" "O pleaſing ſound!" "Antinomianiſm "without a maſk!" You readily perceive, Sir, that the gentleman

help unregenerate hearers to believe they may be God's children, without God's image, provided they get evangelical phraſes concerning Jeſus's love in their mouths, and a warm zeal for party on their hearts? You know, Sir, that you do not mean to include yourſelf in theſe charges; and tho' you condemn all the evangelical preachers in ſo peremptory a manner, yet I *defy* you, (pardon my uſing your own expreſſion) to produce one example of the truth of what you have here affirmed; and to accuſe

---

I mean is the late humble, holy, and learned Mr. Hervey. Yes, Sir, Mr. Hervey himſelf had the courage *to loſe his reputation* by preaching upon this text, and even to publiſh his ſermon after he had preached; yea, though he does not make Chriſt the wicked man, but divides his heads in the following order.

Firſt, What the wicked man ſhould turn from—*Wickedneſs.*

Secondly, What he ſhould turn to—*to do that which is lawful and right.*

Thirdly, What will be the effect of ſuch turning—*He ſhall ſave his ſoul alive.*

This he farther enforces by exhortations, to turn from

A Thoughtleſs
A Prayerleſs
An Inſenſible
} State.

O Sir, when will you forbear, when will you acknowledge your raſh cenſures? It is true, the faithful miniſters of Chriſt uſually chooſe ſuch portions of ſcripture to preach upon, as give them opportunity of ſpeaking largely upon the freeneſs, fullneſs and all-ſufficiency of the goſpel ſalvation, and herein they ſtrictly adhere to the Apoſtle's example, who *determined to know nothing but Jeſus Chriſt, and him crucified.* Like a wiſe maſter-builder, he firſt laid the foundation in faith, and then raiſed the ſuperſtructure in holineſs; and every one who is an ambaſſador, commiſſioned by God himſelf, will *go and do likewiſe.*

But it ſhould ſeem by what follows, that to preach upon the covenant of grace, and upon the diſtinct offices which each of the Perſons in the Trinity ſuſtains in this covenant, gives particular diſguſt to the Vindicator, who cannot mention the ſubject without a ſneer at the boldneſs of ſuch preachers: who, he tells us, *ſpeak of it as confidently as if the King of Kings had admitted them members of his privy council.* But though they make no pretenſions of this ſort, yet they believe, that whatever was decreed in God's council from all eternity, concerning his church and people, is now revealed in his word, from which, by the help of his ſpirit, his mind and will may be evidently known; and from the diſcoveries they there meet with concerning that glorious *covenant which is ordered in all things and ſure*, they believe that *neceſſity is laid upon them* to ſpeak of it to their hearers, as what ſhould be *all their ſalvation and all their deſire.* And I think this cannot be done

in

accuſe a whole body of men, and not to be able to make good your accuſation in a ſingle inſtance, is ſurely *bearing falſe witneſs* in the moſt cruel degree.

Again, Are you in the number of thoſe *who give their congregations particular accounts of the covenant between the perſons of the bleſſed Trinity, and ſpeak of it as confidently as if the King of Kings had admitted them members of his privy-council?* You know, Sir, that you have no need to fear the ſcourge of your own pen in theſe particulars; therefore, whilſt you would make

---

in a clearer manner than by Mr. Romaine, in what you juſtly ſtyle *his edifying paraphraſe on the* 107*th Pſalm*; from which, (as you expreſs ſo great a liking for it), I beg to preſent you with the following abſtract: "The holy, bleſſed, and glorious Trinity, out of infinite "love and compaſſion, were pleaſed to agree upon this plan, and "to ſuſtain diſtinct offices in the œconomy of it; and as their perſons "are equally infinite, their œconomical actions muſt conſequently be "equally infinite. God the father covenanted to demand perfect "ſatisfaction for ſin; and to accept the perfect ſatisfaction made by "the obedience and ſufferings of God the ſon, which he covenanted "to make in our ſtead, and as our repreſentative in the human nature. "And God the holy ſpirit covenanted to render the obedience and "ſufferings of Chriſt effectual to believers, and by his grace to carry "on the whole work of redemption in their hearts. St. Paul aſſures "us, that the covenant of grace, which is the fountain of all mercy, "was made before the foundation of the world, &c." *Mr. Romaine on the* 107*th Pſalm.*

This Mr. F——r and I both agree to be an *edifying* account of the covenant of grace. However, I fear we ſhall not get Mr. Weſley to be of our opinion; for, in his letter to Mr. Hervey, he abſolutely denies, over and over, that there ever was any ſuch covenant between the perſons in the Trinity; and that the new covenant was not made with Chriſt, but with David (which therefore muſt mean David according to the fleſh). However, Mr. Hervey, in his eleven letters in anſwer to Mr. Weſley, has admirably proved this important doctrine, by the moſt irrefragable teſtimony of ſcripture; to which letters, for brevity's ſake, I refer the reader. But did I ſay, I was fearful we ſhould not get Mr. Weſley to be of our opinion? Surely, it was becauſe I did not well conſider what Mr. Weſley has affirmed in his note on Iſa. lv. 3, where ſpeaking expreſsly on the covenant of grace and peace made between God and David, he ſays, "David here "ſeems to be put for the ſon of David;" and, in his note on the next verſe, poſitively aſſerts, that "This David is Chriſt."

In his Chriſtian Library, vol. XLVII. p. 62, Mr. Weſley is ſtill more explicit on this head; for he there ſays, "That Chriſt may be "looked upon not only as a *ſurety*, but as a *party* in this covenant of

make weak bigots admire your *voluntary humility* in not excepting yourſelf from the charges which you bring againſt your brethren in the miniſtry, it is well if you feel nothing of the ticklings of ſelf-applauſe, which would conſtrain you to *go up to the Temple*, and *thank God* that you are totally free from *the faſhionable ſhibboleth* of that *finiſhed ſalvation*, which is the *ſtalking horſe of every wild ranter*.

But as you would ſeem, at leaſt, to wiſh that your own ſin, as a miniſter, ſhould be confeſſed, with that of your brethren, let me exhort you to begin that confeſſion *with tears of ſhame*. 1ſt, For the bitter ſpirit in which you have attacked a perſon

---

" grace, being not only bound to God, but likewiſe covenanting " with him for us."

But how ſhall I reconcile your high approbation of Mr. Romaine's Paraphraſe on the 107th Pſalm, with your ſaying, " How rarely do " the miniſters who are fond of preaching upon the covenant between " God and David ſpeak of it in a practical manner, or dwell upon " ſuch ſcriptures as theſe! "*Becauſe they continued not in my covenant,* " *I regarded them not*; becauſe *they have tranſgreſſed the law, changed* " *the ordinances, and broken the everlaſting covenant, therefore hath* " *the curſe devoured the earth*, &c. &c. *They kept not the covenant* " *of God, and refuſed to walk in his law; therefore, a fire was* " *kindled in Jacob, the wrath of God came upon them, he ſlew the* " *fatteſt of them, and ſmote down the choſen of Iſrael.*"

Now, Sir, are you not aware that this is not the new covenant, the covenant of grace, which is ſpoken of in theſe texts; but that very covenant which the Apoſtle tells us was *not faultleſs*, and which giveth place to that ſecond and better covenant which was eſtabliſhed upon *better promiſes?* " *Not according to the covenant that I made* " *with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead* " *them out of the land of Egypt; becauſe they continued not in my cove-* " *nant, and I regarded them not, ſaith the Lord. For this is the cove-* " *nant that I will make with the houſe of Iſrael after thoſe days, ſaith* " *the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in* " *their hearts: And I will be to them a God, and they ſhall be to me* " *a people: And they ſhall not teach every man his neighbour, and every* " *man his brother, ſaying, Know the Lord; for all ſhall know me,* " *from the leaſt to the greateſt. For I will be merciful to their un-* " *righteouſneſs, and their ſins and iniquities will I remember no more.*" Heb. viii. Here, Sir, is Chriſt in all his offices: 1ſt. As a Prophet, to teach his people; " They ſhall not teach every man his brother, for " they *all ſhall know me:*" 2dly. As a Prieſt, to atone for them: " I will be merciful to their unrighteouſneſs, and their ſins, &c." 3dly. As a king, to change their hearts, and to rule over them and in them: " I will put my laws into their minds, and write them in " their hearts."

But

perſon of Mr. Shirley's amiable and meek character. 2dly, For the great miſrepreſentations and perverſions which you have been guilty of. 3dly, For handling the word of God deceitfully, and villifying the doctrines of free ſovereign grace; ſuch as election, perſeverance, that man has naturally no free-will to good, and Juſtification by Chriſt's imputed Righteouſneſs. 4thly, For flying in the face of the tender mother that nouriſhes you, the church of England, and writing againſt almoſt all her doctrinal articles to which you have ſolemnly ſet your hand [I]. And when you have done this, I ſhall believe that your

---

But you may ſay, how can the old covenant, which was broken and which *vaniſheth away*, be called the *everlaſting covenant?* I anſwer, becauſe the law is *everlaſting*, both in its nature and in its demands.—But for farther ſatisfaction on this point, ſee Vitringa on Iſa. xxiv. 5. See alſo Iſa. lix. 1—15. Ezek. xxii. 7—14, &c.

I hope this is ſufficient apology for miniſters to preach upon the covenant of grace, and to declare that it is indeed ordered in all things and ſure.

I know nothing of what Mr. F——r alludes to by Mr. Weſley being attacked in the Goſpel Magazine; but this I remember, that ſome ſtrictures were made in that magazine upon Mr. Weſley's ſermon on Mr. Whitefield's death; and that thereupon Mr. Weſley began a very hot attack upon Mr. Romaine in the public papers; though Mr. Romaine declared, that, ſo far from being the author or inſerter of the ſtrictures, he did not ſo much as ſee them till after their publication.

[I] Our ninth article, ſetting forth the total apoſtacy of human nature, is contradicted by ſuppoſing there is any power left in man to do conditional works, in order to obtain favor with God. It is alſo peremptorily contradicted by the doctrine of ſinleſs perfection; foraſmuch as the article teacheth, "That the fleſh luſteth ALWAYS "contrary to the ſpirit; and that this infection of nature doth re-"main, yea, in them that are regenerate, whereby the luſt of the "fleſh (φρόνημα σαρκὸς) is not ſubject to the law of God; and that "concupiſcence and luſt hath of itſelf the nature of ſin."

The tenth article is flatly contradicted by the doctrine of free-will.

The eleventh article is as flatly oppoſed by the conceit of *merit* and conditional works.

The twelfth article is again contradicted by the notion of ſinleſs perfection; for that article affirms, that even the works of believers *cannot bear the ſeverity of God's judgment*; but if they are without ſin, they certainly *can* bear the ſeverity of God's judgment.

The thirteenth article is cried down by teaching, that ſinners are to do ſomething in order to juſtification, and to obtain favour with God; whereas that article declares, that works before juſtification *are not pleaſant to God, but have in them the nature of ſin.*

make weak bigots admire your *voluntary humility* in not excepting yourſelf from the charges which you bring againſt your brethren in the miniſtry, it is well if you feel nothing of the ticklings of ſelf-applauſe, which would conſtrain you to *go up to the Temple*, and *thank God* that you are totally free from *the faſhionable ſhibboleth* of that *finiſhed ſalvation*, which is the *ſtalking horſe of every wild ranter*.

But as you would ſeem, at leaſt, to wiſh that your own ſin, as a miniſter, ſhould be confeſſed, with that of your brethren, let me exhort you to begin that confeſſion *with tears of ſhame*. 1ſt, For the bitter ſpirit in which you have attacked a perſon

---

" grace, being not only bound to God, but likewiſe covenanting " with him for us."

But how ſhall I reconcile your high approbation of Mr. Romaine's Paraphraſe on the 107th Pſalm, with your ſaying, " How rarely do " the miniſters who are fond of preaching upon the covenant between " God and David ſpeak of it in a practical manner, or dwell upon " ſuch ſcriptures as theſe! "*Becauſe they continued not in my covenant,* " *I regarded them not*; becauſe *they have tranſgreſſed the law, changed* " *the ordinances, and broken the everlaſting covenant, therefore hath* " *the curſe devoured the earth*, &c. &c. *They kept not the covenant* " *of God, and refuſed to walk in his law; therefore, a fire was* " *kindled in Jacob, the wrath of God came upon them, he ſlew the* " *fatteſt of them, and ſmote down the choſen of Iſrael.*"

Now, Sir, are you not aware that this is not the new covenant, the covenant of grace, which is ſpoken of in theſe texts; but that very covenant which the Apoſtle tells us was *not faultleſs*, and which giveth place to that ſecond and better covenant which was eſtabliſhed upon *better promiſes?* " *Not according to the covenant that I made* " *with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead* " *them out of the land of Egypt; becauſe they continued not in my cove-* " *nant, and I regarded them not, ſaith the Lord. For this is the cove-* " *nant that I will make with the houſe of Iſrael after thoſe days, ſaith* " *the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in* " *their hearts: And I will be to them a God, and they ſhall be to me* " *a people: And they ſhall not teach every man his neighbour, and every* " *man his brother, ſaying, Know the Lord; for all ſhall know me,* " *from the leaſt to the greateſt. For I will be merciful to their un-* " *righteouſneſs, and their ſins and iniquities will I remember no more.*" Heb. viii. Here, Sir, is Chriſt in all his offices: 1ſt. As a Prophet, to teach his people; " They ſhall not teach every man his brother, for " they *all ſhall know me:*" 2dly. As a Prieſt, to atone for them; " I will be merciful to their unrighteouſneſs, and their ſins, &c." 3dly. As a king, to change their hearts, and to rule over them and in them: " I will put my laws into their minds, and write them in " their hearts."

But

perſon of Mr. Shirley's amiable and meek character. 2dly, For the great miſrepreſentations and perverſions which you have been guilty of. 3dly, For handling the word of God deceitfully, and villifying the doctrines of free ſovereign grace; ſuch as election, perſeverance, that man has naturally no free-will to good, and Juſtification by Chriſt's imputed Righteouſneſs. 4thly, For flying in the face of the tender mother that nouriſhes you, the church of England, and writing againſt almoſt all her doctrinal articles to which you have ſolemnly ſet your hand [I]. And when you have done this, I ſhall believe that your

---

But you may ſay, how can the old covenant, which was broken and which *vaniſheth away*, be called the *everlaſting covenant?* I anſwer, becauſe the law is *everlaſting*, both in its nature and in its demands.—But for farther ſatisfaction on this point, ſee Vitringa on Iſa. xxiv. 5. See alſo Iſa. lix. 1—15. Ezek. xxii. 7—14, &c.

I hope this is ſufficient apology for miniſters to preach upon the covenant of grace, and to declare that it is indeed ordered in all things and ſure.

I know nothing of what Mr. F——r alludes to by Mr. Weſley being attacked in the Goſpel Magazine; but this I remember, that ſome ſtrictures were made in that magazine upon Mr. Weſley's ſermon on Mr. Whitefield's death; and that thereupon Mr Weſley began a very hot attack upon Mr. Romaine in the public papers; though Mr. Romaine declared, that, ſo far from being the author or inſerter of the ſtrictures, he did not ſo much as ſee them till after their publication.

[I] Our ninth article, ſetting forth the total apoſtacy of human nature, is contradicted by ſuppoſing there is any power left in man to do conditional works, in order to obtain favor with God. It is alſo peremptorily contradicted by the doctrine of ſinleſs perfection; foraſmuch as the article teacheth, "That the fleſh luſteth ALWAYS "contrary to the ſpirit; and that this infection of nature doth re-"main, yea, in them that are regenerate, whereby the luſt of the "fleſh (φρόνημα σαρκὸς) is not ſubject to the law of God; and that "concupiſcence and luſt hath of itſelf the nature of ſin."

The tenth article is flatly contradicted by the doctrine of free-will.

The eleventh article is as flatly oppoſed by the conceit of *merit* and conditional works.

The twelfth article is again contradicted by the notion of ſinleſs perfection; for that article affirms, that even the works of believers *cannot bear the ſeverity of God's judgment*; but if they are without ſin, they certainly *can* bear the ſeverity of God's judgment.

The thirteenth article is cried down by teaching, that ſinners are to do ſomething in order to juſtification, and to obtain favour with God; whereas that article declares, that works before juſtification *are not pleaſant to God, but have in them the nature of ſin.*

 Again,

your reproofs are levelled at yourself, as well as at others of your brethren.

All I shall say with regard to your quotations from Dr. Crisp is, that although I firmly believe the Doctor to have been a great and a good man, (and as far from real Antinomianism as Mr. Wesley is from Calvinism,) yet it is certain, that some of his expressions are very unguarded. However, notwithstanding you have picked and culled his sentences, without any reference to what goes before, or follows after, in order to place them in the most disadvantageous light; I say, notwithstanding you have acted in this unfair manner, you have really pitched upon some places, which, if not the very words of Scripture, are at least the plain sense of it. To instance only in a few particulars, among many others which might be brought: Dr. Crisp says, "All our righteousness is filthy."

Again, The fifteenth article, of *Christ alone without sin*, is contradicted, point blank, by that monstrous doctrine of sinless perfection; since this article teaches, "*That all we, though baptised, and born again in Christ, yet offend in many things; and if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.*" Alas! that our reformers should thus whet the Antinomian appetite of their hearers, by making them believe that *sin shall always dwell in the inner chamber of the heart!*

The sixteenth article, which says, "*They are to be condemned who say they can no more sin as long as they live here,*" is also positively contradicted by the Perfectionists.

As to the seventeenth article, Mr. F——r and Mr. Wesley have not only *printed* and *preached* against it, but Mr. Wesley has loaded with the name of horrible blasphemers, every one who believes it; and to crown all, with the same hand which subscribed to the truth of it, as a godly doctrine, full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort, has maintained that it makes God worse than the devil. Serm. entitled Free Grace.

How these gentlemen can answer it to their consciences, as ordained ministers of the Established Church, (and especially as pleaders for perfection) thus to oppose all her most essential doctrines, I leave to their own mature consideration.

And here I would also observe, that Mr. F——r gives us very wrong ideas of the case, in his Vindication (p. 15), when he says, that the Lambeth articles were *rejected* by our governors in church and state. The fact is simply as follows: When king James the first was moved by Dr. Reynolds, at the Hampton-Court Conference, to insert those articles, his majesty replied, that there was no want of them, "as the doctrine they contained was *already sufficiently established by the 17th article.*" Apregnant proof this, in what light our *governors, in church and state*, would have looked upon any man who should endeavour to put an Arminian interpretation upon that article.

The

The prophet Iſaiah ſays, *All our righteouſneſſes are as* FILTHY *rags.* Iſa. lxiv. 6.—" Chriſt does all his work *for* him, as " well as *in* him that believes." Dr. Criſp. *Lord, thou wilt ordain peace* FOR *us; for thou haſt wrought all our works* IN *us.* Iſa. xxvi. 12. *For their ſakes I ſanctify myſelf.* John xvii. 19. *It is God that worketh in you, both to will and to do of his good pleaſure.* Phil. ii. 13.—" There is no better way to know " your portion in Chriſt, than upon the general tender of the " goſpel to conclude abſolutely he is yours." Dr. Criſp. *Whoſoever will, let him take the water of life freely.* Rev. xxii. 17.—" A man (a believer) does ſin againſt God. God reckons not " his ſin to be his, he reckons it Chriſt's, therefore he can- " not reckon it his." Dr. Criſp.—Mr. Weſley ſays nearly the very ſame words in that hymn juſt re-publiſhed in his new collection: *Jeſu, thou art my righteouſneſs, for all my ſins were thine.* David bears Dr. Criſp and Mr. Weſley both out in theſe expreſſions, by ſaying, *Bleſſed is the man to whom the Lord* IMPUTETH NO *ſin*; and St. John affirms, *If any man ſin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jeſus Chriſt the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our ſins.* St. Paul ſaith, *He hath made him ſin for us.* And, indeed, if the ſins of God's children are not reckoned to Chriſt, then he loſes his character and office as their ſurety; and their ſins being reckoned to themſelves, they muſt neceſſarily come into condemnation every hour and moment of their lives, unleſs they are in the number of thoſe perfect ones, in whom *no one ſinful thought can riſe* [K]; *no wrinkle of infirmity, no ſpot of ſin remains*; yea, in whom *in-dwelling ſin hath no place at all*, they having received *Chriſt in a pure and ſinleſs heart.*

But not to dwell any longer upon this point, I will let you take the ſtrongeſt expreſſions that can be collected out of Dr. Criſp's writings, and will engage to match them, and doubly match them, from the works of Mr. Weſley, even ſince he has *done leaning too much towards Calviniſm*, and ſince he drew lots whether or no he ſhould not *preach and print* againſt it. Take, for inſtance, that very *unguarded*, though not *ill meant*, phraſe of the Doctor's, " *There is no ſin that a believer ever* " *commits that can poſſibly do him any hurt.*" To this expreſſion Mr. Weſley echoes his approbation in the following lines, which a dear friend of mine, who is a zealous preacher of *finiſhed*

[K] This and the following paſſages allude to Hymns and Sacred Poems by Mr. J. and C. Weſley, vol. II. p. 216, 232, 299, and vol. II. p. 287.

ſalvation,

ſalvation, left out of the hymn in his own collection (we may well ſuppoſe), as ſavouring too highly of *Criſpianity*.

No! my beſt actions cannot ſave,
But thou muſt purge e'en them;
And (for in thee I now believe)
MY WORST CANNOT CONDEMN.

This is certainly ſtrong meat; and, at leaſt, equals Dr. Criſp. But what ſollows goes as much beyond the Doctor as the Doctor himſelf goes beyond the Minutes. For whereas Dr. Criſp only ſays, that the ſins of a particular believer *can do him no hurt*; Mr. Weſley holds, that the ſins of the whole world *cannot hurt him*: "This alone, this receiving Chriſt in the heart, maketh "a man both holy and happy; and evidenceth that this true "juſtification is only through faith, not through works: I "ſay through faith, which apprehending Chriſt with all his "goodneſs, challengeth and maketh it all his own. Then ſin, "death, the devil, and hell, give back affrighted; and, in "much confuſion, vaniſh away. And ſo powerful doth the "merit of Chriſt through faith work, that EVEN THE "SINS OF THE WHOLE WORLD CANNOT HURT "SUCH AN ONE." Mr. Weſley's Chriſtian Libr. vol. I, p. 200.

I AGREE with you, Sir, that it argued great irreverence, and even want of common decency in the man you allude to (p. 63), who, when you were preaching laſt ſummer, not only diſturbed all around him, but accuſed you, after ſervice, of being a free-willer, and of praying as if all might be ſaved.

A ſimilar incident befel a friend of mine, and nearly about the ſame time that you met with the ill uſage you complain of. He had ſcarcely done preaching when a woman cried out, in the congregation, "This is not the voice of my beloved." My friend took no notice of her at that inſtant; but aſking a perſon near him who ſhe was, he was anſwered, "She is one "who for ſome time fancied herſelf perfect, and now the poor "creature is gone quite crazy." My friend gave me leave to inſert his name, and the place where the fact happened; but I told him it was not worth while, as I thought it abſurd to the laſt degree, to draw any concluſions for or againſt particular doctrines, on account of the follies and extravagancies of individuals, who profeſs to believe or diſbelieve thoſe doctrines. You cannot however, be angry with me, Sir, if for once, after the example of the Vindicator, I have diſgraced my page with

ſo

ſo trifling an anecdote, which, I confeſs, proves nothing more than that, in every age and among every ſort of profeſſors of religion, fools and enthuſiaſts are ſure to be found.

But upon ſecond thoughts, I look upon both of THESE OBJECTORS AS MODEST, [L] in compariſon of ſome preachers who have ſubſcribed to the ninth article of our church, which ſaith in the very words of St. Paul, that *(even in the regenerate) the fleſh luſteth againſt the ſpirit and the ſpirit againſt the fleſh*, and yet will ſing hymns before a whole congregation in which they call God's faithful miniſters *Satan's preachers, the Devil's factors, advocates for ſin*, witneſſes of *their lying Lord, members of the ſynagogue of Satan, children of the old roaring helliſh murderer* [M], and many other Billingſgate names of the like import, becauſe they give credit both to the Apoſtle and to the church of England, and affirm, that "*whilſt we are in this tabernacle* "*we groan, being burthened.*" I am ſure "*if Chriſt* (as you ſay he did (p. 63), *came down from Heaven to preach the doctrine of perfection in his ſermon upon the mount*," if we were to judge ſuch teachers by their own words and expreſſions, we might almoſt think that they came up from *another place* to ſing againſt thoſe who deny it. And this reminds me of an anecdote which happened not many months ago at D——n in the county of Salop, where one of Mr. Weſley's preachers told the congregation, (with as much confidence and aſſurance as if he were come expreſs with the news) "that there were many "ſouls now burning in the flames of hell, for whom the pre-"cious blood of Chriſt was ſhed." He alſo aſſured them, "that there were many ſouls upon earth as perfect as ever they "would be in glory." And to crown all, ſaid, "I know "nothing of imputed righteouſneſs, and I pray God I never "may!" The conſequence of this ſermon was, that the hearers requeſted the preacher's abſence for the time to come, many declaring that they would never hear him again; whereupon, he gave a practical comment upon his *perfect* doctrine, by falling into a *perfect* paſſion, and from that time has greatly obliged the people by keeping himſelf away from them.

BUT not only are our *free-grace preachers* all condemned, but *our evangelical congregations*, without exception of a ſingle perſon, muſt all ſhare the ſame fate, particularly if God has placed any of them above the common rank, ſo that they come into the claſs of what Mr. F——r ſtyles *our genteel believers*, and whom he ſo ſeverely cenſures for having their houſes fur-

[L] See Second Check, p. 63.

[M] Theſe appellations are all taken from Mr. Weſley's hymns.

niſhed,

niſhed, and their perſons cloathed, ſuitable to their ſtation in life. Now, though I would by no means be a pleader for luxury and extravagance, and would have every believer, let his condition be what it will, to keep on the ſide of moderation, and rather underdo than overdo; yet I can by no means adopt the levelling ſcheme, or ſet aſide thoſe diſtinctions, which are no leſs authoriſed by reaſon itſelf than by the word of God. Upon which account, I can ſee no more ſin in a lady of fortune or quality, becauſe ſhe wears a ſilk, or brocade, than I ſee it ſinful in the wife of a labourer to wear a ſtuff or a linſey. It is the ſentiment of the devout Archbiſhop Leighton, that a very humble heart may lie under a rich ſtomacher, whilſt a very proud one may hardly have a rag to cover it.

When Abraham's ſervant too was ſent to ſeek Rebecca for Iſaac, Gen. xxiv. 22, he gave her an ear-ring and bracelets, which I ſuppoſe he would hardly have done by the command of the Father of the faithful if the wearing of them had been ſinful. And when the prophet Iſaiah reproves the daughters of Sion, and mentions the manner in which they were attired, he ſeems wholly to level his rebuke at their haughty ſpirit, their wanton gait and ſtretched-out necks; and upon theſe accounts threatens the deſtruction of them and of thoſe decorations, which they made uſe of only to feed their pride and vain-glory. And indeed, if you ſuppoſe that their ſin conſiſted in merely wearing the particular ſorts of dreſs mentioned by the Prophet, then *a caul*, *a bonnet*, *an hood*, *or a veil* on the head, or even *a mantle* on the ſhoulders, (eſpecially to have any *change of apparel)* would be equally criminal, ſince theſe are as much mentioned by the letter of the ſcripture referred to, as *rings*, *ear-rings*, or *bracelets*.

But I am ſorry to hold a moment's controverſy about ſuch trifles as theſe; and therefore beg to end it entirely by ſaying, once for all, Let every one examine the ſtate of their hearts as to theſe matters; and if they can adopt the words of Eſther, "Thou knoweſt all things, O Lord; thou knoweſt that I "hate the glory of the unrighteous; thou knoweſt my neceſ-"ſity; for I abhor the ſign of my high eſtate which is upon "mine head, in the days wherein I ſhew myſelf, and that I "abhor it as a filthy rag, and that I wear it not when I am in "private by myſelf:" I ſay, if this be the ſecret language of their hearts, far be it from me to brand them as carnal Antinomians on account of any outward diſtinctions of apparel.

What you would particularly allude to by thoſe *brittle veſſels and toys*, *which the heathens themſelves deſpiſed*, and what by *the Chineſe characters over-againſt the candleſtick upon the plaſter*

of

of the wall, (where any man that fears the God of Daniel may make out Antinomianism) I am at a loss to discover, unless (for you are there speaking of costly furniture) you mean foreign china, or India figures upon the paper with which the *genteel believer's* room is hung. If I have guessed right, then permit me to say, that I think those among the few noble, mighty and honourable, whom God has chosen by his grace, have no more need to be ashamed of having china in their houses, or silver candlesticks upon a mahogany table, either for use or ornament, than those of a low degree need be ashamed of their earthen ware, or of their brass candlestick upon an oaken stool.

It is true you have quoted a text or two, which on first view seem to countenance that *neglecting of the body*, which nevertheless is little better than *will-worship* or *voluntary humility*. Let me, therefore, ask you, Sir, in the words of my favourite author, Mr. Hervey, "Do you rightly understand St. Paul "in these places? Do you not dwindle his manly and noble "ideas into a meanness and littleness of sense; such as befits "the superstitious and contracted spirit of a hermit, rather "than the generous and exalted spirit of a believer?

"St. Paul does not forbid the use of pearl or costly array, "when a person's circumstances will afford them, and his situa- "tion in life may require them; he rather cautions against the "abuse, against looking upon these glittering things as any part "of their true dignity, on which they value themselves, or "by which they would be recommended to others. The word "is not ἐνδύσασθαι, *put on*, nor φορεῖν, *wear*, but κοσμεῖν, *adorn*; "the meaning therefore is, "Let them not place their excel- "lency in such mean distinctions; not covet to distinguish "themselves by these superficial decorations; but rather by the "substantial ornaments of real godliness and good works, "which will render both them and their religion truly ami- "able." Letter X. p. 263.

To the same purpose Luther. "These things sufficiently "declare who be the true Saints indeed, and which is to be "called an holy life; not the life of those which lurk in caves "and dens, which make their bodies lean with fasting, which "wear hair-cloth, and do other like things with this persua- "sion and trust, that they shall have some singular reward in "Heaven above all other Christians; but of those which be "baptized and believe in Christ, which put off the old man, "with his works, but not at once, for concupiscence and lust "remain in them as long as they live: the feeling whereof "doth hurt them nothing at all if they suffer it not to reign in "them, but subdue it to the spirit." *Luther on Galat.*

Again, If they rightly underſtood theſe things " they (the " monks) would not ſo highly eſteem their own ſuperſtitions, " to go with an heavy countenance, hanging down the head, " to live unmarried, to live on bread and water, to be poorly " apparelled, &c. &c. Theſe monſtrous and ſuperſtitious " works they have deviſed and choſen to themſelves, God " neither commanding, nor approving the ſame. So great " is the blindneſs of man's reaſon, that it is unable not only to " judge rightly of the doctrine of faith, but alſo of external " converſation and works; wherefore, we muſt fight ſtrongly " againſt the counterfeit viſor and holy ſhow of our own *will-* " *works*, ſeem they never ſo excellent and holy. *Ibid.*

But whatever may be your opinion of *our genteel believers*, and however hardly you may cenſure them for ſeverity to the poor, yet, bleſſed be God! I know many, even in an exalted ſphere of life, that willingly condeſcend to do the loweſt offices for the loweſt of their brethren: And if it would not ſhock their humility, and fill them with an holy ſhame, to have their names, works and labors of love, both to the ſouls and bodies of their fellow creatures, thus publicly mentioned, I could point out to you ſome diſtinguiſhed Dorcaſes and Phebes, even in this our day (and, what you will think more extraordinary, ſuch as make their boaſt in a *finiſhed ſalvation)*, who with their own hands adminiſter medicines to the ſick and needy; who themſelves make garments for the naked; and who themſelves joyfully viſit garrets and ſick beds, that they may not only relieve the bodily wants of the diſtreſſed, but may point them to Jeſus, the great phyſician of ſouls. And if you think that Mr. Weſley's Arminian doctrine produces any better effects in his ſocieties, the teſtimony of one of his own friends will aſſure you of the contrary, as appears from the following letter, which Mr. Weſley has printed in his Journal from May 1765 to May 1768, p. 108.

" SIR,

" I was yeſterday led to hear, what God would ſay to me " by your mouth. You exhorted us, *ſtrive to enter in at the* " *ſtrait gate.* I am willing ſo to do. But I find, one chief " part of my ſtriving, muſt be, to feed the hungry, to clothe " the naked, to inſtruct the ignorant, to viſit the ſick, and " ſuch as are in priſon, bound in miſery and iron.

" But if you purge out all who ſcorn ſuch practices, or at " leaſt are not found in them, how many will remain in your " ſociety? I fear, SCARCE ENOUGH TO CARRY " YOUR BODY TO THE GRAVE! Alas, how many

" even

" even among thoſe who are called believers, have plenty of " all the neceſſaries of life, and yet complain of poverty? How " many have houſes, and lands, or bags of money, and yet " cannot find in their hearts to ſpare now and then to God's " poor a little piece of gold? How many have linen in plenty, " with three or four ſuits of clothes, and can ſee the poor go " naked? They will change them away for painted clay, or " let the moths devour them, before they will give them to " cover the nakedneſs of their poor brethren, many of whoſe " ſouls are clothed with glorious robes, though their bodies " are covered with rags. Pray, Sir, tell theſe, you cannot " believe they are Chriſtians, unleſs they imitate Chriſt, in " doing good to all men, and hate covetouſneſs, which is " idolatry."

Mr. Weſley ſays in anſwer, " I do tell them ſo."—But to uſe Mr. Baxter's expreſſion, ſo often adopted by Mr. F——r, " See what all this over-doing tends to."

Do not miſtake me, Sir; I am far from blaming you for bearing open teſtimony againſt the lukewarm ſtate of the church in general, and of profeſſors in particular. God knows there is need of it; and I heartily wiſh that more of the genuine fruits of primitive faith and love abounded among us. But I blame you for the bitter, raſh, ſarcaſtic and uncharitable ſpirit which you have manifeſted; for the very ſevere, and very unjuſt reflections which you have either directly or indirectly thrown out againſt the celebrated and eminent miniſters of the day; thereby hardening the hearts of your readers againſt them, inſtead of ſhewing yourſelf thankful for ſuch burning and ſhining lights; and for having branded with Antinomianiſm the moſt glorious truths of the goſpel.

I beg leave to conclude with an extract from a letter which I have juſt received from a worthy miniſter of Chriſt, concerning the ſtate of a young perſon in his pariſh, who is now on the borders of eternity; and I the rather do this, as having been myſelf (in ſome meaſure) an eye-witneſs of the ſanctifying, practical effects, which the belief of the doctrine of free grace produced in her life and converſation. The following are my friend's own words.

" P—— C——y continues much the ſame as to her body, " and happy as any one can be out of Heaven in her ſoul. She " told me, ſhe had not the leaſt doubt of her ſalvation; that " ſhe longed to be diſſolved, and to be with Chriſt; that her " faith grew ſtronger every day; and that ſhe could ſet her " ſeal as a witneſs to the truth of the doctrines preached to

" her. I aſked her then, whether ſhe could take any comfort " from her duties, prayers, repentance, or her patience under " her affliction? Oh, no (ſaid ſhe); nothing but Chriſt; I " plead nothing in my behalf but his blood and righteouſneſs. " I feel the ſweet promiſes of his word applied to my heart in " the night ſeaſon. Seeing her ſo firmly eſtabliſhed upon the " ſure foundation, I thought I might venture to aſk her, how " ſhe would be able to bear it, if any one ſhould tell her, It " was needful for her to look to her graces and works, in " order to procure a ſecond Juſtification at the bar of God? " Oh, Sir (ſaid ſhe), that would be robbing me of all my " comfort. If I did not believe in the *finiſhed ſalvation* of " Jeſus, I ſhould give up all, and ſink into deſpair; but now " I long for the time of my departure."

Here, Sir, you have one inſtance, among many thouſands which might be produced, of a ſoul triumphing in the views of death as a diſarmed enemy, placing all her confidence in that *free grace*, *imputed righteouſneſs* and *finiſhed ſalvation*, which you make the *impious plea* of an Antinomian reprobate; and declaring, that the very thought of a ſecond Juſtification by her own works would tend to ſink her into deſpair, and to rob her of all her comfort. The worſt wiſh I harbour towards dear Mr. F——r is, that his latter end may be like hers; and that both he and I may be happy partakers of the ſame faith and patience, in the ſame awful hour of trial. With this prayer in my mouth, and I truſt in my heart alſo, I ſubſcribe myſelf,

Reverend Sir,

Your ſincere Wellwiſher of Chriſt's Sake,

The Author of P. Q.

LETTER

LETTER VI.

REVEREND SIR,

I AM under the neceſſity of charging you with a moſt notorious perverſion and miſrepreſentation of facts, in affirming, that the multitude of Puritan divines in the laſt century, and all the churches of Chriſt, are on the ſide of the Minutes, and of the Vindicator.

This charge I have as yet only confirmed by a general denial of your aſſertion; and as it will be impoſſible to cite all the confeſſions of the reformed churches abroad, or to bring quotations from all or half the Puritan divines of the laſt century, I muſt content myſelf with a few abſtracts from the Confeſſion of Faith eſtabliſhed by the Weſtminſter aſſembly, *anno* 1648, and ſigned by no leſs than one hundred and ſix Puritan divines, including eight commiſſioners from the kirk of Scotland, who were members of that aſſembly; and after each head, I ſhall give the tenets of the church of Rome, from the accurate Alexander Roſs, that the reader may clearly ſee, whether you adhere moſt cloſely to the good old Puritan divines, or to that *ſon of perdition, who oppoſeth and exalteth himſelf above all that is called God, or that is worſhipped, and whom the Lord ſhall deſtroy with the brightneſs of his coming* [P]. To theſe I ſhall add a few extracts from the confeſſions of the reformed churches abroad, after having referred you to ſome of the articles of the church of England.

Now whereas the Minutes are introduced by ſaying, "We "have leaned too much towards Calviniſm," on the article of Predeſtination the aſſembly thus expreſs themſelves:

[P] By applying this paſſage of ſcripture to the Pope, I have given the reader the moſt common interpretation of it; though I think they have more argument on their ſide who apply it to Mahomet.

I. Weſt-

[I.]

Weſtminſter Aſſembly *on Predeſtination and Election.*

" Thoſe of mankind that are predeſtinated unto life, God, " before the foundation of the world was laid, according to " his eternal and immutable purpoſe, and the ſecret council " and good pleaſure of his will, hath choſen in Chriſt unto " everlaſting glory, out of his mere free-grace and love, " without any foreſight of faith, or good works, or perſe- " verance in either of them, or any other thing in the crea- " ture as conditions or cauſes moving him thereto, and all to " the praiſe of his glorious grace." *Confeſſion of Faith.*

Church of Rome *on Predeſtination and Election.*

" They (the Papiſts) hold election mutable, becauſe, (ſay " they) the elect may totally fall from faith and righteouſneſs; " and ſome of them hold, that foreſeen works were the cauſe " of election." *Roſs on all Religions*, p. 429.

[II.]

Weſtminſter Aſſembly *on Free Will.*

" Man by his fall into a ſtate of ſin, hath wholly loſt all " ability of will to any ſpiritual good accompanying ſalvation; " ſo as a natural man, being altogether averſe from that good, " and dead in ſin, is not able, by his own ſtrength, to con- " vert himſelf, or to prepare himſelf thereunto.

" When God converts a ſinner, and tranſlates him into " the ſtate of grace, he freeth him from his natural bondage " under ſin, and by his grace alone enables him freely to will " and to do that which is ſpiritually good; yet ſo as that, " by reaſon of his remaining corruption, he doth not per- " fectly nor only will that which is good, but doth alſo will " that which is evil." *Confeſſion of Faith.*

Church of Rome *on Free Will.*

" They (the Papiſts) hold that an unregenerate man hath " freedom of will in matters of ſalvation, though not with- " out the help of grace; ſo that he may hinder or further " his converſion, and may, by his natural power, co-operate " with grace." *Roſs on all Religions*, p. 429.

III. Weſt-

[III.]

Weſtminſter Aſſembly *on Juſtification.*

" Thoſe whom God effectually calleth, he alſo freely juſti-
" fieth; not by infuſing righteouſneſs into them, but by
" pardoning their ſins, and by accounting and accepting their
" perſons as righteous; not for any thing wrought in them,
" or done by them, but for Chriſt's ſake alone: not by
" imputing faith itſelf, the act of believing [M], or any other
" evangelical obedience to them as their righteouſneſs, but by
" imputing the obedience and ſatisfaction of Chriſt unto them,
" they receiving and reſting on him, and on his righteouſneſs
" by faith, which faith they have not of themſelves, it is the
" gift of God." *Confeſſion of Faith.*

Church of Rome *on Juſtification.*

" They (the Papiſts) hold, that a man is juſtified by
" works, not in the *firſt*, but *ſecond* Juſtification." *Roſs on all Religions*, p. 429.

[IV.]

Weſtminſter Aſſembly *on Sanctification.*

" Sanctification is, throughout all the whole man, yet im-
" perfect in this life; there abideth ſtill ſome remnants of
" corruption in every part; whence ariſeth a continual and
" irreconcilable war. The fleſh luſteth againſt the ſpirit,
" and the ſpirit againſt the fleſh; in which war, although
" the remaining corruption for a time may very much pre-
" vail, yet, through the continual ſupply of ſtrength from
" the ſanctifying ſpirit of Chriſt, the regenerate part doth
" overcome; and ſo the ſaints grow in grace, perfecting ho-
" lineſs in the fear of God." *Confeſſion of Faith.*

Church of Rome *on Sanctification.*

" They (the Papiſts) hold, that the good works of juſt
" men are abſolutely juſt, and in a manner *perfect.*
" That concupiſcence and ignorance are only *infirmities.*"
Roſs on all Religions, p. 429.

[M] Here Mr. Baxter's creed, John Goodwin's, and that of *Mr. Ignorance*, and of ſeveral others, is declared to be unſound and heterodox.

V. Weſt-

[V.]

Weſtminſter Aſſembly *on Perſeverance.*

" They whom God hath accepted in the beloved, effectu-
" ally called and ſanctified by his ſpirit, can neither totally nor
" finally fall away from the ſtate of grace; but ſhall certainly
" perſevere therein to the end, and be eternally ſaved.—This
" perſeverance of the ſaints depends not upon their own free-
" will, but upon the immutability of the decree of election,
" &c." *Confeſſion of Faith.*

Church of Rome *on Perſeverance.*

" They (the Papiſts) hold, that juſtifying faith may be
" totally loſt in the regenerate." *Roſs on all Religions*, p. 431.

Having thus proved that the Puritans are not (as you aſſert) on your ſide, I could alſo prove that the Proteſtant Churches ſpeak as little in your favour: It would run me into too great a length to extract all that is to be found in the confeſſions of thoſe churches, touching a ſecond juſtification by works and ſinleſs perfection. The Church of England, in her 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th, 13th, 15th, 16th, and 17th articles, very explicitly ſpeaks for us—In the confeſſion of *Saxony*, the notion of calling the remains of corruption in believers by any other name than *ſin* is thus reproved: " Some extenuate their evils,
" and name them *deformities* beſide the law of God. But
" this blindneſs is greatly to be reproved, and we muſt conſi-
" der both the greatneſs of the evil in this whole pollution,
" which is contrary to the law and will of GOD; and alſo
" the greatneſs of the mercy and benefit of the Son of GOD,
" who covereth theſe great and lamentable wounds in this
" miſerable nature."—In the confeſſion of *Wirtemberg*, touching juſtification, it is ſaid, " When we appear before the judg-
" ment-ſeat of GOD, we muſt not truſt to the merit of any of
" thoſe virtues which we have, but only to the merit of our
" Lord Jeſus Chriſt, whoſe merit is ours by faith; and be-
" cauſe that before the tribunal-ſeat of God, where the queſ-
" tion is of true and eternal righteouſneſs and ſalvation, there
" is no place at all for the merits of men, but only for the
" mercy of GOD, and the merits of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt
" alone, &c.—" Let us confeſs," ſays the Church of *Saxony*,
" with true grief, that there remain as yet in the regenerate
" man many ſins, and much pollution worthy of the wrath
" of GOD." In ſhort, Sir, the only church I can find on your ſide in theſe points, is the Church of Rome, which I have

have plainly ſhewn does ſupport many of your capital doctrines, by the decrees of the council of Trent; but all the Proteſtant Churches are againſt you, as appears from the *Harmony of Confeſſions* from whence I have cited the above paſſages, and to which, for brevity's ſake, I muſt refer you.

Now, let any man, who has but the right uſe of his ſenſes, review the foregoing extracts, and compare them with the doctrines contained in *the Minutes*, and in the *Vindication*, and *Second Check to Antinomianiſm*, and let him then ſay, whether the Proteſtant Churches abroad, as well as our worthy diſſenting brethren at home, have not cauſe to join me in the accuſations which I have brought againſt you. Sure I am, that you have grieved many a pious heart among the latter, by fathering upon their venerable anceſtors ſuch a ſpurious offspring, as can only trace its deſcent from the loins of *the man of ſin*, by whom it was begotten, out of *the mother of abominations*, the *ſcarlet Babyloniſh whore, which ſitteth upon many waters*. What a pity is it, that, before Mr. F——r took upon him to enliſt Mr. Whitefield and John Bunyan, together with all the Proteſtant churches and multitude of Puritan divines, under Mr. Weſley's banner, he did not pay a little more regard to the aſſertion with which he ſets out; "I do not admire the faſhion-"able method of advancing general charges, without ſupport-"ing them by particular proofs." But whoſoever can take upon him to extol Mr. Weſley as a man of ſenſe, and a man of honour, for ſubſcribing to the 17th article, of Predeſtination, as "*a godly doctrine, full of ſweet, pleaſant, and unſpeakable* "*comfort*," whilſt he believes it to be a moſt ungodly doctrine, full of horrible, black, and unſpeakable blaſphemy, will not ſtick at any difficulties which may be thrown in his way. But I ſhould have remembered your aſſertion, Sir: "The Minutes MUST be vindicated."

As you cannot but know out of what dunghill your doctrines are raked, in order that you may evade the name which juſtly belongs to the abettors of ſuch tenets, and that you may the more eaſily impoſe upon the unwary reader, you begin by crying fire firſt, though you yourſelf have kindled the flame. However, that none may have their eyes blinded by this deceitful duſt, I have, in the courſe of theſe letters, ſhewn, (from authors of the moſt approved authority) that your principles are really and truly thoſe of the Romiſh church, and particularly of the order of the Jeſuits [N];

[N] Whoſoever has leiſure and opportunity of conſulting biſhop

and ſorry indeed am I to ſay, that your unfair manner of writing, in order to ſupport your tottering ark, bears but too much reſemblance to the practice of that crafty ſet of deſigning men.

In your firſt performance (p. 82), you make it your prayer to God, "That he would defend you from ſuch friends." i. e. Such as would enter their proteſt againſt the Minutes. This ſevere expreſſion I took no notice of in my former addreſs to you, but wrote to you as to a friend, to a brother, to a father in Chriſt. But, indeed, Sir, you have now taken moſt effectual methods, by your treatment of thoſe friends, and of many others, who once ſincerely loved and honoured you, to obtain an anſwer to your petition: for you have dreſſed them up, in Devil's cloaths, as the Papiſts did John Huſs, and then burnt them for heretics in the flames of hell. Add to this, that you have hardened the hearts of all the ungodly againſt them, and given much occaſion (as I can tell from my own knowledge) to all the anawakened clergy into whoſe hands your book has fallen, to rejoice over thoſe humble, holy, laborious men of God, whoſe doctrines you have ſo horridly miſrepre-

---

Jewell's Apology for the church of England, againſt Harding the Jeſuit; Doctor Andrew Willet's Synopſis of Popery; Biſhop Downham upon Juſtification by the imputed Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, againſt Cardinal Bellarmine; Biſhop Hall's "No Peace with Rome;" and Doctor Fulke, or Mr. Cartwright againſt the Teſtament put out by the Jeſuits of Rhemes, will find the whole ſyſtem of Mr. Weſley's divinity ſtrenuouſly contended for by the Papiſts, and fully and ſatisfactorily confuted by the above able champions for the Proteſtant faith. Nor do the decrees of the Council of Trent itſelf, againſt the reformed churches, leſs harmonize, in many reſpects, with the Minutes, and the two Vindications of them, than the articles of the church of England bear teſtimony againſt them. However, I do not affirm, that Mr. Weſley's opinions partake only of the Popiſh leaven; but if I were charged upon oath, to give the moſt exact account of them that I could, I muſt ſay, that they are a mixture of Pelagianiſm, Semi-Pelagianiſm, Arminianiſm, Popery, Myſticiſm, and Quakeriſm. As confeſſed Proteſtant divines, Mr. Weſley and the Vindicator ſtand quite alone; having adopted a ſcheme of religion, gathered out of all the above-named ſects. And I am not afraid to challenge Mr. F——r, to fix upon one Proteſtant miniſter, either Puritan, or of the church of England, from the beginning of the Reformation, to the reign of Charles the ſecond, who held the doctrines he has been contending for; and if he cannot do this, what muſt we think of his repeated aſſertions, that all the good old Puritan divines, and all the Proteſtant churches, are on his ſide.

ſented,

ſented, and whoſe characters you have ſo publicly aſperſed, by treating them, I ſhall not ſay with want of *reſpectful love*, but with want of *common decency*. Excuſe the warmth of my expreſſion, Sir; and remember I have it from your own performance, p. 26.

Thus, Sir, have you put an inſurmountable bar to all future union with thoſe good men whom you have marked out as the objects of your reſentment, till it ſhall pleaſe God to ſoften your ſpirit and to give you repentance to the acknowledgment of the truth. The only cement of Chriſtian union is the love of God, and the foundation of that love muſt be laid in believing the truths of God: for, to uſe the words of Dr. Owen, in his Diſplay of Arminianiſm, "An agreement "without truth is no peace, but a covenant with death, and "a conſpiracy againſt the kingdom of Chriſt."

With my ſincere wiſhes and prayers that God would give you and me a right judgment in all things, and enable us not only to embrace the ſaving truths of the goſpel, but to drink deep into the ſpirit of its meek and bleſſed Author, I conclude,

Reverend Sir,

Your ſincere Wellwiſher,

Both for the Goſpel and its Author's Sake,

The Author of P. O.

POSTSCRIPT.

SINCE the foregoing ſheets were finiſhed, I received a letter from a judicious friend, deſiring me to conſult the place you refer to from Mr. Flavel, in your Vindication (p. 46); and adding in pretty ſtrong terms, that you had moſt notoriouſly perverted the quotation. Hereupon I borrowed the book, and when I turned to the place alluded to, I was aſtoniſhed beyond meaſure, to find how you had endeavoured to impoſe upon your readers. I could no longer blame my worthy and reverend friend for the expreſſions which had dropped from his pen, and particularly for his putting the queſtion to me, "Could you have expected ſuch diſingenuity from "Madeley?"

The treatiſe which your mangled citation is taken from, may be found in the firſt vol. folio, of Mr. Flavel's works, p. 707, 708, 709. It is entitled, "*A Succinct and Seaſonable Diſcourſe* "*of the occaſions, cauſes, nature, riſe, growth, and remedies of* "*mental errors*;" and is ſigned by the ſeven following miniſters; John How, Vin. Alſop, Nath. Mather, Increaſe Mather, John Turner, Rich. Bures, and Thomas Powel.

I ſhould have been glad could I have tranſcribed the whole diſcourſe, but on account of its length that will be impoſſible. However, the ſcope and deſign of it is to acquaint the reader, that they (the miniſters before-mentioned) had ſigned a paper, teſtifying their firm belief, that Dr. Criſp's ſon had faithfully publiſhed his father's works to the world; that he had not acted the part of a *Falſarius* (to uſe their own expreſſion); and *that he would not ſay that was his father's which was not ſo.* They declare however, that they did not give that certificate by way of approbation of *all* that is contained in the doctor's former works, printed many years before, but are well pleaſed theſe latter writings (of his) are publiſhed, as they contain many paſſages in them, that may in ſome meaſure remedy the hard and hurtful conſtruction which many expreſſions were more liable

to

to in the former works; of which the Doctor himſelf (they ſay) ſeemed apprehenſive, as appears from his ſermons on Titus ii. 11, 12. entitled, *Free-grace the Teacher of Good Works.* As to the character given here of the author (Dr. Criſp), not only by ſome but by many good men, it is "that he was a learned, "pious, good man."

I fear I ſhall not do juſtice to thoſe divines, whoſe meaning you have ſo groſsly perverted, if I content myſelf any farther with an abridgment of their diſcourſe; and therefore muſt, for fear of inaccuracy, tranſcribe their own words, given us p. 708.

"Upon that view of Dr. Criſp's ſermons we have had ſince "the publication, we find there are many things ſaid in them "with that good ſavour, quickneſs and ſpirit, as to be very "apt to make good impreſſions upon mens hearts; and do "judge, that being greatly affected with the grace of God to "ſinners himſelf, his ſermons did thereupon run much in that "ſtrain. All our minds are little and incomprehenſive; we "cannot receive the weight and impreſſion of all neceſſary "things at once, but with ſome inequality; ſo that when the "ſeal goes deeper in ſome part, it is the ſhallower in ſome "others.

"If ſome parts of Dr. Criſp's works be more liable to ex- "ception, the danger of hurt thereby ſeems in ſome meaſure "obviated in ſome other: As, when he ſays, p. 46, vol. I. "Sanctification of life is an inſeparable companion with the "juſtification of a perſon by the free-grace of Chriſt; and, "vol. IV. p. 93, that in reſpect of the rules of righteouſ- "neſs, or the matter of obedience, we are under the law ſtill, "or elſe we are lawleſs, to live every man as ſeems good in "his own eyes, which I know no true Chriſtian dares ſo "much as think.

"In like manner, whereas, vol. II. Serm. XV. and per- "haps elſewhere, the Doctor ſeems to be againſt evidencing "our juſtification and union to Chriſt by our ſanctification and "new obedience: we have the truth of God in this matter "plainly delivered by him, vol. IV. p. 36, when he teacheth, "that our obedience is a comfortable evidence of our being in "Chriſt; and on that, as well as on many accounts, ne- "ceſſary [O]."

[O] Whoſoever will conſult both the places referred to, will ſee that the Doctor is by no means againſt evidencing our juſtification by our ſanctification in either; tho' he affirms, that it is the *direct act* of faith which muſt bring comfort to the believer's ſoul.

" The difference between him, and *other good men*, ſeems " to be not ſo much in the things which the one or other of " them believes, as about their order and reference to one " another; where, it is true, there may be very material dif- " ference: but we reckon, that, notwithſtanding what is more " controverſible in theſe writings, there are much more ma- " terial things wherein they cannot but agree, and would have " come much nearer each other, even in theſe things, if they " did take ſome words or terms, which come into uſe on the " one or the other hand, in the ſame ſenſe; but when one " uſes a word in one ſenſe, another uſes the ſame word (or " underſtands it being uſed) in quite another ſenſe, here ſeems " a vaſt diſagreement, which ſeems, at length, to be *verbal* " only, and *really* none at all."

At the beginning of the next paragraph, we have the two expreſſions out of the Doctor's works which you have brought. —The one is, that *ſalvation is not the end of any good work we do*; the other, that *we are to act from life, and not for life*. Both theſe expreſſions are vindicated, from any licentious meaning, by the ſeven Puritan Divines, (or, as you ſtyle them, *the body of Puritan Divines*), whoſe names are annexed, and are candidly interpreted by other explanatory paſſages in the Doctor's own works. They then point out, in the words which you have given us, (with the addition of three lines of your own, or thereabouts, not a word of which is to be found in the book [P], the *looſe*, or, as they call it, the *rigid* ſenſe, in which theſe two expreſſions are capable of being taken by *harſh* and *uncharitable* men. And, after having done this, they add the following concluſion, drawn from the foregoing premiſes, which you have wholly omitted, and given your readers that very concluſion againſt Dr. Criſp, which theſe old, pious divines have affirmed (to keep ſtill to their own words) " *is* " *not* WITH ANY TOLERABLE CHARITY *ſuppoſable*."— Their words are theſe: " But let none be ſo *harſh* as to think " of any *good man*, that he intended any thing of all this. If " every paſſage that falls from us be *ſtretched and tortured with* " *the utmoſt ſeverity*, we ſhall find little to do beſides accuſing " others, and defending ourſelves as long as we live." P. 709.

[P] Mr. F——r has not, indeed, put commas to theſe three lines, expreſly to mark them for a quotation; but he has annexed them to the extract; and then, after his own addition, (and not immediately after the real quotation,) he has written, " Preface to Mr. Flavel's book againſt Antinomianiſm."

Thus,

Thus, Sir, all you get by bringing the quotation in queſtion, is, that every reader cannot help condemning the unhandſome manner of your proceeding; and, in the ſenſe of that very body of Puritan Divines you would make the world believe have ratified your cenſures againſt Dr. Criſp, you have not only *ſtretched and tortured* the words of a *good man with the utmoſt ſeverity*, but have acted with an *harſhneſs*, and *want of charity*, which, in their opinion, was not only INTOLERABLE, but even *not ſuppoſable*.——However, I aſſure you, Sir, I am very willing to hearken to any thing you have to offer in vindication of yourſelf on this head. I am inclined to hope you made the extract from ſome other writer who has miſled you, and not from Flavel himſelf. And, with regard to the falſe quotation you have given us from the Minutes, I would flatter myſelf that you wrote it (as you thought) from memory, without having the original before your eyes. But then, how can we exculpate Mr. Weſley, to whom the correction of your book was ſubmitted? Yet far be it from me to deviate ſo widely from the rules of politeneſs, as to ſay either to Mr. Weſley or to Mr. F——r, upon this occaſion, what Mr. Weſley himſelf once ſaid upon a ſimilar one to a great dignitary of the church, "*'Tis well for you that* FORGING QUOTATIONS *is not* "*felony* [Q]."

ALL I have to obſerve upon your Poſtſcript, relative to the Paris converſation, is, that the very reaſon why you object to the Friar's teſtimony, as making nothing againſt the Minutes (viz. that in Paris 50,000 recruits might have been raiſed againſt the Bible itſelf) is the moſt forcible argument imaginable againſt your doctrine; for, if it be a truth, that the inhabitants of that city are all in league againſt the pure word of God and the doctrines of the Reformation, then how much more oppoſite to theſe muſt the Minutes be, when even a Popiſh Monk could ſay, "the author of thoſe Minutes is a Pelagian." "The tenets of the church of Rome are nearer to the Proteſtants than thoſe contained in that paper?" Add to this, that the order of Benedictins is not one of thoſe that embraces the opinion of the Janſeniſts, but abides by the deciſions of the Council of Trent; and, therefore, the concluſion drawn from the dialogue is but too juſt; viz. that "Popery is about the midway between Proteſtantiſm and Mr. John Weſley." However, the poor Benedictin friar muſt needs be dubbed a

---

[Q] Mr. Weſley's Second Letter to the Author of the Enthuſiaſm and Methodiſts compared, p. 13.

Criſpian

Criſpian heretic for diſſenting from Mr. Weſley; though there is not the leaſt tendency to Antinomian principles in any thing that he ſpoke.

I ſay no more on the ſubject of this dialogue: But, becauſe ſome perſons may have imagined, from a paragraph which appeared in the ſame pamphlet, that Mr. Shirley had not ſufficient authority for the inſertion of my name, I beg to add, that though I was not preſent when the circular letter was completed, yet I was in company with Mr. Shirley, and ſeveral other friends, when the rough draft of that letter, in ſubſtance the ſame with the printed one, was drawn up; and, therefore, if any readers have ſuppoſed that Mr. Shirley did what was done without my knowledge, I beg to undeceive ſuch, and to throw all the blame upon myſelf. And, indeed, the more I conſider the dreadful tendency of the Minutes, and that all ſerious, religious perſons are indiſcriminately ranked under the name of Methodiſts, the more am I convinced of the neceſſity there was that they who deſire to give all the glory of their ſalvation to Chriſt alone, ſhould openly teſtify their diſapprobation of all ſuch tenets as would nullify the grace of God, and turn the Goſpel itſelf into a covenant of works.

THE

A

FARRAGO

OF

HOT AND COLD MEDICINES.

By the Rev. Mr. JOHN WESLEY,

Author of the PRESERVATIVE againſt UNSETTLED NOTIONS in RELIGION.

Extracted from his OWN PUBLICATIONS.

Doth a fountain ſend forth, at the ſame place, ſweet waters and bitter? James iii. 11.

A double-minded man is unſtable in all his ways. James i. 8.

Ever learning, but never able to come to the knowledge of the truth. 2 Tim. iii. 7.

The teſtimony of the Spirit is uniform, and free from contradictions.

Mr. Weſley's Chriſt. Lib. vol. XXXVI. p. 138.

Contradiction, didſt thou ever know ſo truſty a friend, or ſo faithful a devotee? Many people are ready enough to contradict others; but it ſeems all one to this gentleman, whether it be another or himſelf, ſo he may but contradict.

Mr. Hervey's Letters to Mr. Weſley.

A FARRAGO.

"The first thing, that, by the grace of God, I am resolved to do, in reference to my everlasting state, is to see my faith, that it be both rightly placed, and firmly fixed, that I may not be as a wave, tossed to and fro, with every wind of doctrine, by the cunning craftiness of those that lie in wait to deceive; but that I may be thoroughly settled in my faith concerning those things, the knowledge of which is absolutely necessary to my future happiness. Let, therefore, what times soever come upon me, let what temptations soever be thrown upon me, I am resolved, by the Grace of God, stedfastly to believe as followeth."

Mr. Wesley's Christian Lib. vol. XLVII. p. 9.

For Election and Perseverance.

THE godly consideration of predestination and our election in Christ, is *full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable* COMFORT.

They that be endued with so excellent a benefit walk religiously in GOOD WORKS [R].

I believe there is a state attainable in this life, from which a man CANNOT FINALLY FALL.

Jour. from Sept. 1741, *to Oct.* 1743, *reprinted anno* 1769.

Sav'd BEYOND THE DREAD OF FALLING,
Let us rise, to the prize,
Of our glorious calling.

Mr. Wesley's Hymns and Spirit. Songs, published an. 1771, p. 6.

Against Election and Perseverance.

THE horrible blasphemous doctrine of predestination and election is not of God, for it makes him worse than the Devil. It is an UNCOMFORTABLE doctrine. It directly tends to destroy our zeal for GOOD WORKS [S].

One who is a true believer, or in other words, one who is holy and righteous in the judgment of God himself, may nevertheless FINALLY FALL FROM GRACE.

Predestination calmly Considered.

Those who live by faith *may yet* FALL FROM GOD, and perish everlastingly.

Mr. Wesley's Sermons Thoughts on the Perseverance of the Saints.

[R] This article Mr. Wesley subscribes *ex animo*, from his heart, declaring, that he believes it *to be agreeable to the word of God*, can. xxxvi. I might, as I proceed, draw the same contrast in many other of our doctrinal articles, but let this suffice for a specimen.

[S] This is the language of that very sermon of Mr. Wesley, on Rom. viii. 32, concerning which he drew lots, whether or no he should preach against what his own hand had subscribed.

For Election and Perſeverance.

I DO NOT DENY, that all thoſe eminently ſtyled the Elect, will infallibly perſevere [T].

Journal from Sept. 1741, *to Oct.* 1743, *reprinted anno* 1769.

We clap our hands, exulting
In thine almighty favour;
The love divine,
That made us thine,
Shall keep us thine for ever.

Select Hymns, with tunes annexed, p. 120.

From all eternity, with love
UNCHANGEABLE thou haſt me view'd;
Ere knew this beating heart to move,
Thy tender mercies me purſu'd!

Hymns, printed at London, 1756.

Our glorified head,
His Spirit hath ſhed,
With his people to ſtay,
And NEVER again will he take him away.

Hymns and Spiritual Songs, p. 7.

He

Againſt Election and Perſeverance.

ST. PAUL DOES NOT DENY, that a believer may fall away, and be cut off between his ſpecial calling and his glorification; NEITHER DOES HE DENY, that many are called, who *never* are juſtified.

Weſley on N. Teſt. Rom. viii. 30.

"I have loved thee with an "everlaſting love; therefore "with loving-kindneſs have I "drawn thee." Do theſe words aſſert, that no righteous man ever turned from his righteouſneſs? no ſuch thing.

Again, He who is a child of God to-day, may be a child of the devil to-morrow.

Thoughts on the Perſeverance of the Saints.

One, even of them whom God had given him, is loſt; ſo far was that decree from being UNCHANGEABLE.

Weſley's note on John xvii. 12.

Thoſe who have been made partakers of the Holy Ghoſt, of the witneſs, and the fruits of the Spirit, may nevertheleſs ſo fall from God, as to periſh everlaſtingly.

Thoughts on the Perſev. of Saints.

Having

[T] By thoſe *eminently ſtyled the Elect*, I ſuppoſe, Mr. Weſley means the ſame as in his hymns he calls,

Th' election of *peculiar grace*,
The choſen prieſts, the royal race.

Hymns and Sac. Poems, vol. II. p. 187.

For Election and Perſeverance.

He will perform the work begun,
Jeſus, the ſinners friend;
Jeſus, the lover of his own,
Will love ME to the end.
Hymns and Sacred Poems, vol. II. p. 178.

Thus is Chriſt among ſpiritual things in THE ELECT WORLD of his Church.
Chriſt. Lib. vol. XXXV. p. 72.

Againſt Election and Perſeverance.

Having loved his own, namely, THE APOSTLES, as the very next words, *which were in the world*, evidently ſhew, he loved THEM unto the end of his life.
See Mr. Weſley's note on John xiii. 1. *and Thoughts on the Perſev. of Saints.*

To ſay that the whole world, in St. John's words, means the whole WORLD OF THE ELECT, is a ſhameleſs ſenſeleſs perverſion.
Doct. of Predeſt. Elect. and Reprob. p. 11.

For Sinleſs Perfection.

THE Son hath made them who are thus born of God free from that great root of ſin and bitterneſs, PRIDE.
Preface to Hymns and Sacred Poems, vol. I p. 159, *printed at London*, 1756.

They, who are thus born of God, are FREED FROM SELF-WILL, as deſiring nothing, no, not for one moment, (for perfect love caſteth out all deſire), but the holy and perfect WILL OF GOD. *Ibid.*

Againſt Sinleſs Perfection.

THEY (the children of God) are daily ſenſible of ſin remaining in their hearts; PRIDE, &c. &c.
Mr. Weſley's Sermon on 2 Cor. v. 17. *entitled, In-dwelling Sin.*

It is the conſtant experience of the children of God, that they feel A WILL not wholly reſigned to the WILL OF GOD. *Ibid.*

Evil

God's

For Sinleſs Perfection.

Evil ſhall not here abide,
Sin ſhall have NO PLACE in me;
From th' iniquity of PRIDE,
And SELF I ſhall be free.
Hymns and Sac. Poems.

They (true believers) are freed from WANDERINGS in prayer. Whenſoever they pour out their hearts in A MORE IMMEDIATE MANNER BEFORE GOD, they have no thought of any thing paſt, or abſent, or to come, but of God alone; to whom their whole ſouls flow in one even ſtream, and in whom they are ſwallowed up. In times paſt they had WANDERING THOUGHTS darted in, which yet fled away like ſmoke; but now the ſmoke does not riſe at all.
Pref. to Hymns and Sac. Poems.

Chriſtians are ſaved in this world FROM ALL SIN, FROM ALL UNRIGHTEOUSNESS.

They are now in ſuch ſenſe perfect as not to commit ſin, and to be freed from ALL EVIL THOUGHTS AND EVIL TEMPERS.
Mr. Weſley's Serm. on Phil. iii. 12, *Not as though I had already attained or were already perfect.*

Againſt Sinleſs Perfection.

God's children are daily ſenſible of ſin remaining in their hearts, PRIDE, SELF-WILL, &c.
Mr. Weſley's Serm on 2 Cor. v. 17; entitled, *In-dwelling Sin.*

Believers in Chriſt feel more or leſs of pride, or ſelf-will ſtealing in, and mixing with their beſt duties, even in THEIR MORE IMMEDIATE INTERCOURSE WITH GOD, when they aſſemble themſelves in the great congregation, and when they pour out their ſouls in ſecret to him who ſeeth all the thoughts and intents of their hearts. They are continually aſhamed of their WANDERING THOUGHTS, or of the deadneſs and dullneſs of their affections.
Weſley's Sermon on Rom. viii. 1.

I am ALL UNRIGHTEOUSNESS;
Falſe and FULL OF SIN I am.
Mr. Weſley's Hymns.

That the corruption of nature doth ſtill remain, even in thoſe who are the children of God by faith, that they have in them the ſeeds of PRIDE AND VANITY, OF ANGER, LUST, AND EVIL DESIRE, YEA, SIN OF EVERY KIND, is too plain to be denied, being matter of daily experience.
Serm. on Rom. viii. 1.

They

St.

For Sinleſs Perfection.

They (true believers) are freed from evil thoughts, ſo that they cannot enter into them, no, not for one inſtant. Aforetime, when an evil thought came in, they looked up and it vaniſhed away, but now it does not come in.

Preface to Hymns and Sacred Poems.

Our bleſſed Lord had no evil or ſinful thought, nor indeed was capable of having any; and even hence it follows that neither have real Chriſtians, for *every one that is perfect is as his maſter.* Therefore, if he was free from evil or ſinful thoughts, ſo are they likewiſe [R].

Sermon on Phil. iii. 12, *Not as though I had already attained.*

Mr. Weſley being aſked by the queriſt, "Do you keep "the WHOLE LAW without offending in one point?" replies, "I believe ſome would "anſwer, WE TRUST "WE DO KEEP THE "WHOLE LAW OF "LOVE."

Being

Againſt Sinleſs Perfection.

St. Paul is ſpeaking to believers, and deſcribing the ſtate of believers in general, when he ſays, "the fleſh luſteth againſt the ſpirit, and the ſpirit againſt the fleſh, and theſe are contrary the one to the other." Nothing can be more expreſs: The Apoſtle here directly affirms that the fleſh, the evil nature, oppoſes the ſpirit even in believers.

Serm. on 2 Cor. v. 17.

This doctrine (of believers being without ſin) is wholly new, never heard of in the church of Chriſt, from the time of his coming into the world till the time of Count Zinzendorf. I do not remember to have ſeen the leaſt intimation of it, either in any ancient or modern writer, unleſs, perhaps, in ſome of the wild RANTING ANTINOMIANS.

Ibid.

Believers in Chriſt are conſcious of not fulfilling THE PERFECT LAW, either in their thoughts, or words, or works.

Serm. on Rom. viii. 1.

They

[R] Mr. Weſley might as well have ſaid, that becauſe Chriſt was God, *ſo are they likewiſe.*

For Sinleſs Perfection.

Being aſked again, "Do you "loveGod as well as you ought "to love him, and ſerve him "as he ought to be ſerved?" To this Mr. Weſley anſwers, "I LOVE HIM WITH "ALL MY HEART, AND "SERVE HIM WITH "ALL MY STRENGTH."

When he to my heart comes in
Thou ſhalt there no longer be;
From that hour, IN-DWELLING SIN,
Thou haſt *no place* in me.
Hymns and Sac, Poems, vol. II. p. 287.

With ſin and Satan ever near,
A SINLESS LIFE WE LIVE.
Hymns and Sac. Poems, vol. II. p. 287.

Whilſt one evil thought can riſe
I AM NOT BORN AGAIN [S].
Hymns and Sac. Poems. vol. II. p. 216. *Printed at London*, 1756.

The

Againſt Sinleſs Perfection.

They (believers) know they DO NOT LOVE THE LORD THEIR GOD WITH ALL THEIR HEART, AND MIND, AND SOUL, AND STRENGTH,
Serm. on Rom. viii. 1.

That believers are delivered from the *guilt* of ſin we allow, that they are delivered from the BEING of it we deny.
Ibid.

Purified Chriſtians are they that are moſt ſenſible of their impurity. Therefore, I called *not* this AN UNIVERSAL FREEDOM FROM POLLUTION, but an univerſal deteſtation of it.
Chriſtian Library, vol. XXXV. p. 19.

Though we readily acknowledge he that believeth is BORN OF GOD, and that he that is born of God doth not commit ſin; yet, we cannot allow *that he does not feel it within.*
Serm. on Mark i. 15.

That

[S] We ſee by this and by ſeveral of the like expreſſions, that the author of theſe hymns did not, at the time of writing them, allow any one could be a believer, even in the loweſt ſenſe of the word, whilſt

For Sinleſs Perfection.	Againſt Sinleſs Perfection.
The Lord will give a white ſtone, A new myſterious name impart, To none but the receiver known, CHRIST IN A PURE AND SINLESS HEART. *Hymns and Sac. Poems*, vol. II. p. 287.	That there are two contrary principles in believers, nature and grace, the fleſh and the ſpirit, runs through all the epiſtles of St. Paul, yea, through all the holy Scriptures. *Serm. on 2 Cor. v. 17.*
Wilt thou lop the boughs of ſin, Leaving ſtill the ſtock behind? No, thy love ſhall work within, Quite expel the CARNAL MIND. Root and branch deſtroy my foe, I believe it ſhall be ſo. *Ibid.* vol. II. p. 149.	As this poſition, that there is no ſin in a believer, NO CARNAL MIND, no bent to backſliding, is contrary to the word of God, ſo it is to the experience of his children. Theſe continually feel an heart bent to backſliding, a natural tendency to evil, a proneneſs to depart from God, and cleave to the things of earth. *Ibid.*
From	How

whilſt he found the leaſt ſtirring of ſin, ſuch ſtirring being a ſure proof that the ſoul was *not born again*, without which there is certainly no intereſt in Chriſt; though at other times he ſuppoſes that the MOST ADVANCED BELIEVERS are deeply ſenſible of their impurity, as is evident from his having publiſhed Dr. Owen's Treatiſe on In-dwelling Sin in his Chriſtian Library, as well as from the quotation I have juſt brought from thence, and which he himſelf has taken from Archbiſhop Leighton, though not without ſome adulterations of his own. Beſides which, he tells us, in his note on Eph. vi. 13. That *the war is perpetual, but the fight one day leſs, another more violent.* I mention this in caſe any one ſhould reply, that Mr. Weſley *ſpeaks of believers of different ſtature.* Neither can it be urged, that ſuch expreſſions were made uſe of when Mr. Weſley *leaned too much towards Calviniſm*; as the poſition (that believers are totally free from ſin) is as diametrically oppoſite to Calviniſm as light is oppoſite to darkneſs. And, indeed, I find by the dates prefixed to the books quoted, that many of the groſſeſt contradictions in this Farrago were publiſhed nearly at the ſame time; and it is not at all improbable,

For Sinleſs Perfection.

From EVERY EVIL MOTION freed,
(The Son hath made us free)
On all the powers of Hell we tread,
In glorious liberty.
Hymns and Sac. Poems, vol. II. p. 248.

God ſhall in thy fleſh appear,
And make an end of ſin.
All the ſtruggle then is o'er,
And wars and fighting ceaſe;
Iſrael then ſhall ſin no more,
But dwell in perfect peace.
Ibid.

No wrinkle of infirmity,
No ſpot of ſin remains.
Ibid. p. 299.

I WRESTLE

Againſt Sinleſs Perfection.

How naturally do thoſe who experience ſuch a change imagine that all ſin is gone; that it is utterly rooted out of their hearts, and has no more any place therein? How eaſily do they draw that inference, I *feel* no ſin, therefore I *have* none; it does not *ſtir*, therefore it does not *exiſt*; it has NO MOTION, therefore it has no *being*? But it is ſeldom long before they are undeceived, finding ſin was only ſuſpended, not deſtroyed.
Serm. on Eph. ii. 8.

This doctrine (that there is no ſin in the regenerate) is attended with the moſt fatal conſequences. It cuts off all watching againſt our evil nature, againſt the Delilah, which we are told is gone, though ſhe is ſtill lying in our boſom. It tears away the ſhield of weak believers, deprives them of their faith, and ſo leaves them expoſed to all the aſſaults of the world, the fleſh, and the Devil.
Serm. on 2 Cor. v. 17.

The

---

bable, that Mr. Weſley was the ſame day correcting the preſs both for and againſt Sinleſs Perfection, &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. I do not, indeed, pretend to ſay which of theſe hymns were compoſed by Mr. John and which by Mr. Charles Weſley; however, as their names ſtand jointly prefixed to the volumes, (two of which were printed at London, two at Briſtol) we are warranted to ſuppoſe that they contain their joint ſentiments; unleſs we were to imagine that theſe two gentlemen are as contradictory to each other, as Mr. John Weſley is to himſelf.

For Sinleſs Perfection.

I WRESTLE NOT NOW, but trample on ſin,
For with me thou art, and ſhalt be within.
Hymns and Sac. Poems, vol. II. p. 120.

God is thine; diſdain to fear
THE ENEMY WITHIN.
Ibid. p. 248.

Our life is hid with Chriſt in God,
The agony is o'er;
WE WRESTLE NOT WITH FLESH AND BLOOD.
We ſtrive with ſin no more.
Hymns and Sac. Poems, vol. II. p. 248.

We dare not give our God the lie;
Saviour from ſin, we thee receive;
Tho' SATAN's SYNAGOGUE deny,
We here a *ſinleſs* life ſhall live.
Ibid. vol. II. p. 292.

Sin ſhall not always live,
OR IN OUR FLESH REMAIN;
We did not, Lord, receive
The word of truth in vain.
Ibid. vol. II. p. 267.

Againſt Sinleſs Perfection.

The fleſh, the evil nature, ſtill remains (though ſubdued) and wars againſt the ſpirit. So much the more let us uſe all diligence in *fighting* the good fight of faith. So much the more earneſtly let us watch and pray againſt THE ENEMY WITHIN; the more earneſtly let us take to ourſelves and put on the whole armour of God, that although WE WRESTLE BOTH WITH FLESH AND BLOOD, and principalities and powers, and wicked ſpirits in high places, we may be able to ſtand in the evil day, and having done all, to ſtand.
Serm. on 2 Cor. v. 17.

We muſt not ſo interpret the Apoſtle's words (*old things are paſt away; all things are become new*) as to make him contradict himſelf; and if we will make him conſiſtent with himſelf, the plain meaning of the words is this: His old judgment (concerning Juſtification, holineſs, happineſs, indeed, concerning the things of God in general) is now paſt away; ſo are his old deſires, deſigns, affections, tempers and converſation; all theſe are undeniably become new, greatly changed from what they were: and yet though they are new, they are not wholly new; ſtill he feels, to his ſorrow and ſhame, REMAINS of the old man. *Ibid.*

For Sinleſs Perfection.

Nor can, nor will I, comfort take
In hearing SATAN's FACTORS plead;
I cannot hug, like them, my chain,
Or reſt, if ſin in me REMAIN.

Tell me no more, ye carnal ſaints,
"The beſt muſt always ſtrive with ſin;
"God will not anſwer *all* your wants,
"God will not make you throughly clean;
"Sin muſt have ſome unhallow'd part,
"Chriſt cannot fill up all the heart."

Can life and death together dwell?
Can Chriſt with Belial e'er agree?
Darkneſs with light, and Heav'n with Hell?
Can both at once have place with me?
Can I be Chriſt's and ſin's abode,
A den of thieves, and houſe of God?

No, Jeſus, no! thou holy One;
When thou ſhalt come into my heart,
I know that thou wilt reign alone,
And ſin for ever ſhall depart.
Hymns and Sac. Poems, v. II. p. 107.

Do

Againſt Sinleſs Perfection.

But "they that are Chriſt's "have crucified the fleſh, with "its affections and luſts;" they have ſo; yet it REMAINS in them ſtill, and often ſtruggles to break from the croſs.
Sermon on 2 Cor. v. 17.

But, (you object) a man cannot be clean, ſanctified, holy, and at the ſame time unclean, unſanctified, unholy: Indeed he may; ſo the Corinthians were. Ye are waſhed, ſays the Apoſtle, ye are ſanctified; and yet at the ſame time, in another ſenſe of the word, they were unſanctified; they were not waſhed, nor inwardly cleanſed from envy, evil-ſurmiſing, partiality. *Ibid.*

But ſure they had not a new heart, and an old heart together. It is moſt ſure they had. But could they be unholy while they were temples of the Holy Ghoſt? Yes; that they were temples of the Holy Ghoſt is certain; and it is equally certain, they were in ſome degree carnal, that is, unholy.
Ibid.

"Certainly a man cannot "be a new creature, and an "old creature at once."—Yes, he may; he may be partly renewed, which was the very caſe with thoſe at Corinth.
Ibid.

We

For Sinleſs Perfection.

Do not the beſt of men ſay, *We groan, being burdened* with the workings of in-bred corruption? "This is not the meaning of the text; the whole context ſhews, the cauſe of that groaning was their longing to be with Chriſt."

Preſervative, p. 224.

He that is by faith born of God, ſinneth not. Nor doth he ſin by INFIRMITIES, whether in act, word, or thought; for his infirmities have no concurrence of his will; and without this, THEY ARE NOT PROPERLY SINS.

Sermon on Eph. ii. 8. p. 7.

Againſt Sinleſs Perfection.

We groan, being burdened with numberleſs infirmities, temptations and ſins.

Mr. Weſley's note on the ſame text.

If we ſay we have no ſin now remaining, we deceive ourſelves. *Many* INFIRMITIES *do remain, whereby we are daily ſubject to* what are called ſins of infirmity; and DOUBTLESS THEY ARE IN SOME SENSE SINS [T], as being tranſgreſſions of the perfect law; and with regard to theſe, it may be ſaid of us all our lives, that in many things we offend all.

The ſame Sermon, on Eph. ii. 8. *next page.*

I draw no contraſt here concerning SINS OF SURPRIZE, Mr. Weſley not having yet determined, whether they bring the ſoul under condemnation or not. Take his own words: "It is more difficult to determine concerning thoſe which are "uſually ſtyled SINS OF SURPRIZE: As when any one,

---

[T] Mr. Weſley and Mr. F——r do not ſeem to have thoroughly ſettled this point yet: For whereas Mr. Weſley here ſays, that "*they are in ſome ſenſe ſins*;" Mr. F——r, on the contrary, calls them, "the INNOCENT INFIRMITIES INCIDENT TO FLESH AND "BLOOD." *Vind.* p. 12. However, ſince this was written, I have ſeen another edition of the ſermon, wherein this groſs contradiction is expunged; though, in that I have in my poſſeſſion, it ſtands exactly as I have tranſcribed it; and it is to be found in thoſe lately printed, and now expoſed to ſale near the chapel in Weſt Street.

who

" who commonly, in patience, poſſeſſes his ſoul, on a ſudden " and violent temptation, ſpeaks and acts in a manner not con- " ſiſtent with the royal law, *thou ſhalt love thy neighbour as thy-* " *ſelf*. Perhaps it is not eaſy to fix a general rule concerning " tranſgreſſions of this nature; we cannot ſay either that men " are or are not condemned for SINS OF SURPRIZE in gene- " ral." *Sermon on Romans* viii. 1.

However, it is much to be wiſhed, (for the good of ſociety at leaſt) that ſins of ſurprize, and ſins of infirmity too, were to be declared *mortal* at the next conference; ſince I am aſſured, upon the very beſt authority, that ſeveral perſons who pretend to reverence Mr. Weſley, do not only fall into outrageous paſſions, but can even cozen and over-reach their neighbours, and then call theſe things *ſins of ſurprize, little innocent infirmities of fleſh and blood, and trifling tranſgreſſions of the law*, which do not deſtroy their perfection, and which none but miſtaken Calviniſts ſuppoſe will bring the ſoul under condemnation. But, reader, let me beg thee to weigh well the foregoing words of Mr. Weſley; " We can- " not ſay either that men are, or are not condemned for ſins " of ſurprize;" and yet, immediately before, he calls them *tranſgreſſions*, as here he calls them *ſins*. Strange divinity this, for one, who, for near forty years paſt, has profeſſed to believe, and to teach, that *ſin is the tranſgreſſion of the law; that the wages of ſin is death*; and that *curſed is every one who continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them*. But let us only conſider what theſe unſcriptural diſtinctions between venial and mortal ſins, and the dividing and ſubdividing ſins into " ſins of ſurprize, innocent infirmities of fleſh and blood, trifling breaches of the law, *mean ſins* (U), &c. &c. " muſt inevitably tend to; *viz.* to the very center of practical Antinomianiſm. For inſtance: One man provokes another by ſome injury, either real or imaginary; the other immediately flies into a violent paſſion, and knocks him down; when reproved for this, may he not anſwer, " It is true, I have both ſpoken and acted unbecoming the royal law of love, but I did it in a ſudden and violent temptation; therefore, I hope God will look upon it only as a *ſin of ſurprize*, which will not bring me under condemnation?" Again, another man is rather too fond of liquor; he undeſignedly falls into bad company, and there widely tranſgreſſeth the royal

---

[U] Hymns and Sacred Poems, printed at London, 1756, vol. II. p. 175.

law

law of temperance: being admoniſhed of his fault, how eaſily may he urge, that what he did was partly through ſurprize, partly through infirmity?—A third, perhaps, is walking in the ſtreet, "in the twilight, in the evening, in the black and dark night;" like Bunyan's Pilgrim, he is ſuddenly aſſaulted by *Wanton*, who deſires him to treat her at the next tavern. The ſimple youth, void of underſtanding, complies; and, when warned of his danger and folly, makes the threefold plea of *ſurprize, infirmity, fleſh and blood.*

This I ſay, Sir, is the evident tendency of your doctrine; and yet I ſtill believe, that you would be grieved if you knew any perſons who made ſuch an uſe of it. Exerciſe then the ſame charity towards the preachers of free-grace; yea, even though you ſhould ſee, that men of corrupt minds ſhould turn that grace into laſciviouſneſs, which *they* declare, upon ſcripture authority, teaches us, that, denying ungodlineſs and worldly luſts, we ſhould live ſoberly, righteouſly, and godly in this preſent world. Again; never call the Calviniſt miniſters, (who, if I judge right, are pointed out by thoſe who occupy our moſt celebrated pulpits; and if they are not, you will pleaſe to undeceive me) I ſay, never more call theſe miniſters Antinomians, and pleaders for ſin, after your attempts to undermine the authority of the law, which is the mind and tranſcript of God's holy will, by ſpeaking of ſuch trifling breaches of that law, as it would argue a partiality in God to ſuppoſe he would puniſh with his curſe; or after talking of the *innocent infirmities of fleſh and blood*, and of *ſins of ſurprize*, which, it cannot be ſaid, *do or do not bring a man under condemnation* [U].

Once more; what avails it that Mr. Weſley has preached and rode twenty miles before *ſome profeſſors have left their downy pillow*, if this be the doctrine he teaches? Though he were to compaſs ſea and land to make proſelytes, and to riſe as early as a Popiſh Monk, or an Indian Bramin, ſtill I venture to aſſert he had much better ſleep quietly, *impriſoned within his bed-curtains*, than to riſe from his own pillow, in order to lull his hearers aſleep upon the *pillow* of falſe ſecurity, by ſpeaking in ſo light a manner of ſin, and making the breach of God's holy law A MERE NOTHING.

But to return to the *Farrago*.

[U] That Mr. Baxter was much of the ſame opinion is clear, by his ſaying, "that the law of works is not abrogated or repealed, but diſpenſed with, or relaxed."

Mr. Weſley's edit. of Baxter's Aphoriſms.

For

For Imputed Righteouſneſs.

BLESSED be God, we are not among thoſe who are ſo dark in their conceptions and expreſſions. We no more deny THE PHRASE (of imputed righteouſneſs) than the thing.

Mr. Weſley's Sermon on Jer. xxiii. 6.

This doctrine (of the imputed Righteouſneſs of Chriſt) I have conſtantly believed and taught for near eight and twenty years. *Ibid.*

I wonder how any man can preſume to exclude the ACTIVE obedience of Chriſt from our juſtification before God.

Chriſt. Lib. vol. XLVII. p. 54

I always did, and do ſtill continually affirm, that the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is imputed to every believer.

Serm. on Jer. xxiii. 6.

Why ſhould you think it a ſtrange thing that the RIGHTEOUSNESS OF CHRIST SHOULD BE IMPUTED.

Chriſt. Lib. vol. IX. p. 231.

The

Againſt Imputed Righteouſneſs.

FOR Chriſt's ſake, and for the ſake of the immortal ſouls which he hath purchaſed with his blood, do not diſpute for THAT PARTICULAR PHRASE, the imputed Righteouſneſs of Chriſt.

Mr. Weſley's Letter to Mr. Hervey.

The uſe of that term (the imputed Righteouſneſs of Chriſt) is not ſcriptural, is not neceſſary, it has done immenſe hurt.

Ibid.

That righteouſneſs or juſtification which believers have in or by Chriſt, is ſtill attributed in ſcripture to the death and ſufferings of Chriſt, and NEVER to his Righteouſneſs, or ACTIVE OBEDIENCE.

Treat. on Juſt.

To hold an imputation of the ACTIVE obedience of Chriſt, amounts to no leſs than an abrogation of his death. *Ib.*

Where is the uſe of contending ſo ſtrenuouſly for the imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs? O lay aſide thoſe queſtionable dangerous expreſſions.

Letter to Mr. Hervey.

That expreſſion, IMPUTING THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF CHRIST, I dare not inſiſt upon, becauſe I cannot find it in the Bible.

Thoughts on Imput. Righteouſneſs.

The

For Imputed Righteouſneſs.

The *wedding garment* is Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, firſt imputed, then implanted.

Notes on New Teſt. Mat. xxii. 12.

This is fully conſiſtent with our being juſtified through the imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs.

Ibid. on Rom. iv. 9.

I myſelf frequently uſe THE EXPRESSION in queſtion, Imputed Righteouſneſs; and *often put this, and the like expreſſions, into the mouth of a whole congregation* (X).

Serm. on Jer. xxiii. 6.

The Righteouſneſs that Chriſt wrought is made ours by Imputation.

Chriſt. Lib. vol. IX. p. 230.

The bride is all holy men, the whole inviſible Church *To be arrayed in fine linen white and clean.* This is an emblem *of the righteouſneſs of the Saints*, both of their JUSTIFICATION and ſanctification.

Mr. Weſley's note on Rev. xix. 8.

I would

Againſt Imputed Righteouſneſs.

The *wedding garment* means holineſs.

Preſer. againſt Unſettled Notions in Religion, p. 234.

A third reaſon againſt the imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, is, there is no neceſſity or occaſion for it.

Treatiſe on Juſtification.

We are all agreed as to the meaning, but not as to THE EXPRESSION, the imputing the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt; which, I ſtill ſay, I dare not inſiſt upon, *neither require any to uſe.*

Thoughts on Imput Righteouſneſs.

That the Scriptures no where countenance any ſuch Imputation of the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, I truſt (the ſpirit of truth aſſiſting) to make manifeſt in this diſcourſe.

Treatiſe on Juſt.

Where it is ſaid (Rev. xix. 8) that it was granted to the Lamb's wife the church, *that ſhe ſhould be arrayed with pure white linen and ſhining*, which is ſaid to be *the righteouſneſs of the Saints*, it is evident, nothing is meant concerning JUSTIFICATION by Chriſt or his Righteouſneſs.

Treatiſe on Juſt.

Upon

[X] Although moſt of theſe extracts from Mr. Weſley's ſermon on Jer. xxiii. 6. have a very evangelical appearance; yet all their ex-

cellency

For Imputed Righteouſneſs.

I would addreſs myſelf to you who violently oppoſe theſe expreſſions, and *are ready to condemn all that uſe them as* ANTINOMIANS. Why ſhould you condemn all who do not ſpeak juſt as you do? Why ſhould you quarrel with them for uſing the phraſes they like, any more than they with you for taking the ſame liberty? At leaſt allow them the liberty which they ought to allow you. And why ſhould you be angry at an expreſſion?

Serm. on Jer. xxiii. 6.

It

Againſt Imputed Righteouſneſs.

Upon Mr. Hervey's only uſeing that ſcriptural expreſſion, "our Saviour's obedience," in his excellent dialogues upon Imputed Righteouſneſs, Mr. Weſley exclaims, "We ſwarm "with ANTINOMIANS on "every ſide. Why are you "at ſuch pains to increaſe "their number?

Again, Is not this (that Chriſt has ſatisfied the demands of the law) the very quinteſſence of ANTINOMIANISM.

Again, To ſay "the claims "of the law are all anſwered," "Is not this ANTINOMIA-"NISM without a maſk?"

Once more, There are many expreſſions in this dialogue, (viz. the 14th, in vindication of the Imputed Righteouſneſs of Chriſt) which lead *directly to* ANTINOMIANISM.

Letter to Mr. Hervey.

If

---

eellency vaniſheth away when we are told, in the ſame ſermon, that the Imputed Righteouſneſs, which the author contends for, is not the divine Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, as God, but his human Righteouſneſs, as man. When we conſider that the expreſs words of the text are, THE LORD, OR JEHOVAH OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS, one might wonder (if any thing is to be wondered at that Mr. Weſley affirms) how he could poſſibly fall into an error, which, at once, not only deſtroys the meritorious efficacy of the Redeemer's Righteouſneſs in behalf of his church, but undermines the virtue of his atoning blood; for, if the Righteouſneſs, which is imputed, be not the *Righteouſneſs* of God, neither is his blood the *blood* of God; and yet both of theſe are expreſly aſſerted by the Holy Ghoſt; who tells us, that believers *are made the Righteouſneſs of God in him*; and that *God purchaſed the church with his own blood.* Not that the divine nature could ſhed blood; but, being united to the manhood of Chriſt, it ſtamped an infinite value

For Imputed Righteouſneſs.

It is by faith that the Holy Ghoſt enables us to build upon this FOUNDATION; [i. e. the Imputed Righteouſneſs of Chriſt.]

Serm. on Jer. xxiii. 6.

But

Againſt Imputed Righteouſneſs.

If faith in the Imputed Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is a FUNDAMENTAL principle of the Goſpel, what becomes of all thoſe who think nothing about Imputed Righteouſneſs? How many, if this be true, muſt periſh everlaſtingly.

Ibid

The

---

value upon all that he did and ſuffered: and hereby, that complete Righteouſneſs was wrought out, in which believers ſtand without ſpot of ſin before God. But that this Righteouſneſs is only a *human righteouſneſs*, appears to me a very ſtrange aſſertion.—And here I am again led to animadvert on Mr. Weſley's unfair abridgment of the Pilgrim's Progreſs, from which he has totally expunged the following ſentence: [*which is the righteouſneſs of God, for he himſelf is God.*] So that the words,

In the REAL Bunyan are,	In the COUNTERFEIT Bunyan,
" Fly to the Lord Jeſus, and " by his righteouſneſs, which is " the righteouſneſs of God, for " he himſelf is God, thou ſhalt be " delivered from condemnation."	" Fly to the Lord Jeſus, and " by his righteouſneſs thou ſhalt " be delivered from condem- " nation."

If it ſhould be ſaid, Surely a man may leave out what he will in an abridgment; I anſwer, But ſurely no one, who anchors all his hope upon the divinity of his Saviour, would ever take out ſo glorious a ſentence as the above, which gives ſpirit and life to all that goes before and follows. Whether or no Mr. Weſley has left this out of the piece in his Chriſtian Library, I do not pretend to ſay, not having examined; but the edition of the Pilgrim's Progreſs, from which I have made my obſervations, was publiſhed by Mr. Weſley ſome years ago, and is ſold ſeparate from his Chriſtian Library.

For the ſame reaſon that Mr. Weſley does not chuſe to have it known how nearly his faith reſembles that of Mr. Ignorance, he is unwilling to be ranked by old Bunyan (whom, Mr. F——r ſays, all the Calviniſts *deſervedly* admire,) among *the Diabolonian armies which fought againſt Immanuel, belied God's word, and ſtumbled the faith of the men of Man-Soul*; and, therefore, with more prudence than candor, has left the whole paſſage, concerning the ELECTION-DOUBTERS, out of the Holy War.

However, that none may ſay I wreſt Mr. Weſley's words, or put a

For Imputed Righteouſneſs.

But is not a believer INVESTED OR CLOATHED with the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt? UNDOUBTEDLY HE IS. And accordingly theſe words are the language of every believing heart:

Jeſu, thy blood and righteouſneſs
My beauty are, my glorious DRESS.

Serm. on Jer. xxiii. 6.

This ſpotleſs ROBE the ſame appears,
When ruin'd nature ſinks in years.

Hymns and Sac. Poems, vol. I. p. 293.

Put on your beautiful GARMENTS, draw towards you with the hand of faith, the rich MANTLE of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs. And it is a wonder how a ſinner can reſt while he is out of this GARMENT; for there is no other in heaven or earth can make him ſhine to God, and ſo ſhelter him from the ſtroke of juſtice.

Chriſt. Lib. vol. XXXV. p. 63.

The

Againſt Imputed Righteouſneſs.

The whole generation of diſputers for that imputation WHICH WE OPPOSE, interpret the phraſe of having the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed, by being CLOATHED with this Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, or with the ROBES of his Righteouſneſs.

Treatiſe on Juſtification.

The Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is a righteouſneſs fit for no man to WEAR, or aſſume to himſelf, but the perſon that wrought it.

Ibid.

To

wrong conſtruction upon them, I am deſirous of giving him an opportunity of explaining himſelf more fully on the head of it's being only the human Righteouſneſs of Chriſt which is imputed to a ſinner for juſtification. If, therefore, Mr. Weſley will acknowledge, that by the Imputation of Chriſt's human Righteouſneſs, he means that mediatorial Righteouſneſs which was wrought out by God in the human nature, I entirely acquieſce with him on the point; but it muſt be owned, he has delivered his thoughts in a very looſe, unguarded manner, by which means he has already drawn upon himſelf the remarks of a judicious writer on that head.

For Imputed Righteouſneſs.

The righteouſneſs that ſaveth us is ALREADY WROUGHT by God.

Chriſt. Lib. vol. IX. p. 253.

The ſole cauſe of our acceptance with God, is the Righteouſneſs and death of Chriſt, who FULFILLED GOD's LAW, and died in our ſtead.

Preface to Hymns, printed anno 1756.

Let faith and love combine
To guard thy valiant *breaſt*;
The plate be righteouſneſs divine,
Imputed and impreſt.

Hymns and Sacred Poems.

I no more DENY the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, than I deny the Godhead of Chriſt. Neither do I DENY IMPUTED RIGHTEOUSNESS. This is another unkind and unjuſt accuſation.

Sermon on Jer. xxiii. 6.

Faith is imputed for Righteouſneſs to every believer; namely, FAITH IN THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF CHRIST.

Ibid.

But

Againſt Imputed Righteouſneſs.

To ſay the righteouſneſs which juſtifies is ALREADY WROUGHT out, is a crude unſcriptural expreſſion.

Preſervative againſt Unſettled Notions in Religion, p. 214.

I cannot prove that it was requiſite for Chriſt to FULFILL THE MORAL LAW, in order to his purchaſing redemption for us. By his ſufferings alone, the law was ſatisfied.

Ibid.

Having on the breaſt-plate of righteouſneſs. The righteouſneſs of a ſpotleſs purity, in which Chriſt will preſent us faultleſs before God, through the merit of his own blood.

Mr. Weſley on the New Teſt. Note on Eph. vi. 14.

You ſee one main reaſon why we DENY THE IMPUTATION OF CHRIST's RIGHTEOUSNESS.

Treatiſe on Juſtification.

That which God requires of us for this purpoſe, (of Juſtification) is our *faith* in Chriſt himſelf, NOT IN THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF CHRIST. *Ibid.*

Wherefore

For Imputed Righteouſneſs.

But now, if we have no ſuch obedience in our ſurety, (as we cannot have, if he did not live as well as die for us) let any one tell me, what TITLE he hath, or can have, to *eternal life?* He hath none in himſelf, becauſe he hath not performed perfect obedience to the law; and he hath none in Chriſt, unleſs Chriſt performed that obedience for him, which none can ſay he did, who doth not believe his ACTIVE as well as PASSIVE obedience to be wholly on our account.

Chriſt. Lib. vol. XLVII. p. 55.

The Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is imputed to every one that believes, as ſoon as he believes: for if he believes according to the Scripture, he believes in the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt [Y].

Serm. on Jer. xxiii. 6.

Neither

Againſt Imputed Righteouſneſs.

Wherefore is this imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs introduced into the buſineſs of juſtification? The introducers ſay with one mouth, the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt muſt be imputed to us, that ſo we may have a right and TITLE to life or heaven. And ſo *apprehending nothing elſe about a believer, fit to make a title of thereto*, they have compelled the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt to take this office upon it in a way of imputation.

Treatiſe on Juſt.

He that is fully acquitted of his ſins, needeth no other Righteouſneſs to give him a TITLE to life.

Ibid.

Therefore believers are not the men that have any ſuch Righteouſneſs imputed to them.

Ibid.

There

[Y] Mr. Weſley cannot forget that when he preached this ſermon, he told the congregation, "*It was the ſame doctrine which Mr. Ro-*" *maine, Mr. Madan, and Mr. Whitefield preached.*" Now therefore, as Mr. Weſley well knew, that theſe gentlemen conſtantly maintained, that a ſinner was juſtified by faith only, as apprehending the perſonal imputed Righteouſneſs of Chriſt; we are not to think that he meant to impoſe upon the credulity of his hearers, by making them believe that he agreed with thoſe miniſters in ſo important a point, when he did not. And if he really was of the ſame mind with them, in this article of faith, and had been ſo for twenty-eight years, what

For Imputed Righteouſneſs.

They to whom the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is imputed, are made righteous by the ſpirit of Chriſt; are renewed in the image of God, after the likeneſs wherein they were created, in righteouſneſs and true holineſs.

Serm. on Jer. xxiii. 6.

Againſt Imputed Righteouſneſs.

The nice metaphyſical doctrine of imputed righteouſneſs, leads not to repentance, but to licentiouſneſs.

I have had abundant proof that inſtead of furthering mens progreſs in vital holineſs, it makes them ſatisfied without any holineſs at all.

Preſerv. againſt Unſettled Notions in Religion, p. 212, 215.

Obedience is as ſtrictly required under the New, as it was under the Old Teſtament; but with this difference; there, obedience in our own perſons was required as abſolutely neceſſary; here, OBEDIENCE IN OUR SURETY IS ACCEPTED, AS COMPLETELY SUFFICIENT.

Chriſt. Lib. vol. XLVII. p. 55.

To ſay, that THE OBEDIENCE OF OUR SURETY IS ACCEPTED INSTEAD OF OUR OWN, is neither a ſafe nor a ſcriptural way of ſpeaking.

Ibid.

Chriſt

This

---

what becomes of the doctrine advanced in the Treatiſe on Juſtification; in his Letter to Mr. Hervey; in his edition of Baxter's Aphoriſms; and in his Thoughts on Imputed Righteouſneſs? Did Mr. Whitefield, Mr. Romaine, or Mr. Madan, ever hold ſuch tenets as are pleaded for in theſe books? Mr. Weſley knows the contrary; and that from their hearts they ſubſcribe to Mr. Hervey's Theron and Aſpaſio, and to his Eleven Letters. Beſides, if Mr. Weſley had conſtantly preached the doctrine of imputed righteouſneſs for 28 years, and, as he tells us in one of his Journals, not leſs than fifty times within the twelvemonth, how came it to paſs that ſo many teſtified their ſurprize at hearing the diſcourſe in queſtion, inſomuch that the doctrine appeared to them quite new, and that they preſſed Mr. Weſley to print his diſcourſe, in order to ſtop the mouths of gainſayers*? Laſtly, if Mr. Weſley had conſtantly maintained this doctrine in the manner Mr. Romaine, Mr. Madan, and Mr. Whitefield preached it, why muſt poor John Bunyan be *embowelled* in order to make him look like Mr. Weſley, and to prevent Mr. Weſley from looking like Mr. Ignorance.

* Journal from May 1765 to May 1768.

For Imputed Righteouſneſs.

Chriſt is now the Righteouſneſs of all them that truly believe in him; he for them paid the ranſom by his death; he for them fulfilled the law in his life; ſo that now in him, and by him, every believer may be called a fulfiller of the law.

Principles of a Methodiſt, p. 17

As we by faith lay hold of it (viz. Chriſt's active Righteouſneſs) ſo God through grace imputes it to us, as if it had been performed by us IN OUR OWN PERSONS.

Chriſt. Lib. vol. XLVII. p. 54

I know not how it is with others; but for my own part, I look upon all my *righteouſneſs as filthy rags*, and it is in the robes only of the righteouſneſs of the ſon of God that I dare appear before the Majeſty of Heaven.

This, therefore, is the righteouſneſs and the manner of that juſtification whereby I hope to ſtand before the judgment-ſeat of God [Z].

Ibid.

I cannot

Againſt Imputed Righteouſneſs.

This is the very core of the miſtake, to think that we have by delegation paid the proper debt of obedience to the whole law, or that in Chriſt we have obeyed perfectly.

Mr. Weſley's extract from Baxter's Aphoriſms.

The Scriptures do not only no-where eſtabliſh, but abſolutely deny a poſſibility of the tranſlation of the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt FROM ONE PERSON TO ANOTHER.

Treatiſe on Juſt. p. 48.

Men reading in the Scriptures of the juſtification of ſinners, or of their being made righteous by Chriſt, have conceived that ſuch a thing cannot be but by a poſitive righteouſneſs, ſome ways put upon them: And there being no ſuch righteouſneſs to be found but the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, hence they have apprehended that juſtification muſt needs be by this Righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed unto them.

Treatiſe on Juſt.

Many

[Z] Since this was ſent to the preſs, a friend of mine has informed me by letter, that about a fortnight ago, a certain Lay-Preacher of Perfection told his hearers, that the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt would not do for him; becauſe Chriſt himſelf had broken the Sabbath.

For Imputed Righteouſneſs.

I cannot look upon Chriſt as having made full ſatisfaction to God's juſtice for me, unleſs he had performed the obedience I owe to God's law, as well as borne the puniſhment that is due to my ſins.

Chriſt. Lib. vol. XLVII. p. 55.

Chriſt paid an ACTIVE and PASSIVE obedience, and ſo did not only fulfill the will of his father in obeying what he had commanded, but ſatisfied his juſtice, in ſuffering the puniſhment due to us for tranſgreſſing it.

Ibid. p. 53.

This I believe to be all true, all agreeable to the oracles of God [A].

There is no true faith, that is *juſtifying faith*, WHICH HATH NOT THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF CHRIST FOR ITS OBJECT.

Ibid.

The

Againſt Imputed Righteouſneſs.

Many ſay, that Chriſt did as properly obey in our ſtead, as he did ſuffer in our ſtead; and that in God's eſteem we were in Chriſt, obeying and ſuffering; and ſo in him we did both perfectly fulfill the commands of the law by obedience, and the threatenings of it by bearing the penalty. And thus, ſay they, is Chriſt's righteouſneſs imputed to us; *viz.* his PASSIVE righteouſneſs, for the pardon of our ſins, and delivering us from the penalty; his ACTIVE righteouſneſs, for the making of us righteous, and giving us a title to the kingdom.

This opinion, in my judgment, containeth a great many miſtakes [B].

Extract from Baxter's Aphor.

Neither is the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt THE OBJECT OF FAITH AS JUSTIFYING.

Treatiſe on Juſt.

Thus

[A] In the preface to this work (viz. The Chriſtian Library, p. 7.) Mr. Weſley, after telling us he believes it to be *all true, all agreeable to the word of God*, aſſures us, "that he hath particularly endeavoured to preſerve a conſiſtency throughout, that no part might CONTRADICT any other, but all conſpire together, to make the man of God perfect, thoroughly furniſhed unto every good word and work."

[B] Mr. Weſley, in his preface to this piece, ſays, "that he ſaw the wiſe providence of God in ſending it to him; and that he thinks it expedient to republiſh it, as an antidote againſt the ſpreading poiſon of Antinomianiſm."

For Imputed Righteouſneſs.

The firſt thing then which admits of no diſpute among reaſonable men in this: To all believers the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is imputed.

Serm. on Jer. xxiii. 6.

Againſt Imputed Righteouſneſs.

Thus have we at laſt fully anſwered all thoſe arguments, which, to my knowledge, have yet been inſiſted upon for the imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs.

Treatiſe on Juſt. p. 207.

Notwithſtanding Mr. Weſley's aſſertion, that he has fully anſwered all thoſe arguments which have been inſiſted upon for the imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs; yet, upon the whole, I believe every reader will think he has ſaid full as much in favour of this doctrine as he has ſaid againſt it; and therefore, we will venture to ſing the victory in the following words of his own hymns:

Join, earth and heaven, to bleſs
THE LORD, OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.
Myſtery of redemption this,
  This the Saviour's ſtrange deſign;
Man's offence was counted his,
  Ours his righteouſneſs divine.

In him complete we ſhine;
His death, his life is mine;
Fully am I juſtified.
  Free from ſin, and more than free;
Guiltleſs, ſince for me he died;
  Righteous, ſince he liv'd for me [C].

Jeſu, thou art my Righteouſneſs,
  For all my ſins were thine.
Thy *death* hath bought of God my peace,
  Thy life hath made him mine.

Jeſu,

[C] "To theſe truths (ſays Mr. Hervey in his Eleven Letters, "p. 29), I moſt cordially ſubſcribe. This is that good old wine "that once made Mr. Weſley's heart glad; he has ſince taſted new; "but I hope he will be brought to ſay, *the old is better.*"

Jeſu, thy blood and Righteouſneſs
My beauty are, my glorious dreſs;
Midſt flaming worlds in theſe array'd,
With joy ſhall I lift up my head.

When from the duſt of death I riſe,
To claim my manſion in the ſkies;
E'en then ſhall this be all my plea,
Jeſus hath liv'd, hath died for me [D].

Let faith and love combine
To guard thy valiant breaſt;
The *plate* be RIGHTEOUSNESS DIVINE,
IMPUTED and impreſt.

IMPUTE THY RIGHTEOUSNESS, &c. &c.

Againſt Juſtification by the Act of Believing.

BUT do not you put faith in the room of Chriſt, or of his Righteouſneſs? By no means; I take particular care to put each of theſe in its proper place.

Sermon on Jer. xxiii. 6.

For Juſtification by the Act of Believing.

BY faith, which is here ſaid to be imputed, cannot be meant the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt. The faith which is ſaid to be imputed to Abraham for Righteouſneſs, is faith properly taken, and not the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt apprehended by faith [E].

Treatiſe on Juſtification.

But To

[D] Who ſhall preſume to ſay that Mr. Weſley hopes for a ſecond juſtification by his works at the day of judgment; when he declares, that in that day Chriſt's blood and Righteouſneſs will be all his plea.

[E] What ſeems the moſt amazing of all is, that Mr. Weſley refers his readers to this Treatiſe on Juſtification, in confirmation of his holding the doctrine of juſtification thro' the imputed Righteouſneſs of Chriſt: Whereas, the whole deſign of the treatiſe itſelf, to which we are referred, is to prove that the imputation of Chriſt's perſonal Righteouſneſs is a falſe and dangerous doctrine; and that it is the act of believing or faith itſelf for which ſinners are accepted of God, and not the Redeemer's Righteouſneſs imputed and received by faith. And therefore it is that this treatiſe, and his Serm. on Jer. xxiii. 6, do ſo groſsly contradict each other, as I have ſhewn from the extracts taken out of both.

Againſt Juſtification by the Act of Believing.

But let it be obſerved, the true ſenſe of thoſe words, *We are juſtified by faith in Chriſt only*, is not, that this our own act, to believe in Chriſt, or THIS OUR FAITH, WHICH IS WITHIN US, juſtifies; for that were to account ourſelves to be juſtified by ſome act or virtue that is within us; but that, although we have faith, hope, and love within us, and do never ſo many good works, yet we muſt renounce the merit of all, of faith, hope, love, and all other virtues and good works, which we either have done, or ſhall do, as far too weak to deſerve our Juſtification; for which, therefore, we muſt truſt only in God's mercy, and the merits of Chriſt; for it is he *alone* that taketh away our ſins: To him *alone* are we to go for this; forſaking all our virtues, good words, thoughts and works, and putting our truſt IN CHRIST ONLY, &c.

This is what I believe, and have believed for ſome years, &c. &c.

Principles of a Methodiſt, p. 8.

For Juſtification by the Act of Believing.

To ſay that faith, or believing, is imputed for Righteouſneſs, but to mean that it is not faith, but the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt that is imputed, muſt needs argue the ſpeaker's deſign to be, that his meaning ſhould not get out at his mouth.

The Faith which is imputed for Righteouſneſs IS HIS; (viz. the believer's) that is, SOMEWHAT THAT MAY TRULY AND PROPERLY BE CALLED HIS, before ſuch imputation of it be made unto him, which cannot be ſaid of the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt.

Treatiſe on Juſtification.

Faith is the condition of the new covenant, therefore it is our Righteouſneſs in relation to that covenant.

Mr. Weſley's Extract from Baxter's Aphoriſms.

Even ſo is our evangelical Righteouſneſs, or faith, imputed to us for as real Righteouſneſs as perfect obedience.

The perſonal performance of faith ſhall be imputed to us, for a ſufficient perſonal payment, as if we had payed the full rent.

That Juſtification by Faith alone, is *Articulus ſtantis vel cadentis Eccleſiæ*, And that all who do not hold it muſt without doubt periſh everlaſtingly.

ONE very conſiderable article of this truth is contained in the words above recited; this is his name whereby he ſhall be called, *The Lord our Righteouſneſs*; a truth this, which enters deep into the nature of Chriſtianity, and, in a manner, ſupports the whole frame of it. Of this *undoubtedly* may be affirmed what Luther affirms of a truth cloſely connected with it [F];—it is ARTICULUS STANTIS VEL CADENTIS ECCLESIÆ; the Chriſtian church ſtands or falls with it. It is *certainly* the pillar and groundwork of that faith, of which ALONE cometh ſalvation; of that catholic or univerſal faith, which is found in all the children of God, AND WHICH, UNLESS A MAN KEEP WHOLE AND UNDEFILED, WITHOUT DOUBT HE SHALL PERISH EVERLASTINGLY.

Serm. on Jer. xxiii. 6.

OUT

That Juſtification by Faith alone, is not *Articulus ſtantis vel cadentis Eccleſiæ*. And that ſuch as do not hold it may without doubt be ſaved everlaſtingly.

MONDAY the 30th (1767), I took coach for Norwich, and in the evening came to Newmarket. Tueſday, December 1ſt, being alone in the coach, I was conſidering ſeveral points of importance, and thus much appeared as clear as the day.

That a pious churchman, who has not clear conceptions even of juſtification by faith, may be ſaved; therefore, clear conceptions, even of this, are not neceſſary to ſalvation.

That a myſtic who denies juſtification by faith, (Mr. Law for inſtance) may be ſaved; but if ſo, what becomes of "ARTICULUS STANTIS "VEL CADENTIS ECCLESIÆ?" if ſo, is it not high time for us, *projicere ampullas, et ſeſquipedalia verba* (G); and to return to the plain word, *he that feareth God, and worketh righteouſneſs, is accepted of him?*

Jour. from 1765, to 1768. *p.* 112.

HOW

[F] Juſtification by faith only.
[G] To throw away theſe great ſwelling words.

That there was an everlaſting Covenant between God the Father and God the Son for Man's redemption.

OUT of compaſſion to fallen man, He (God the Son) covenants with his Father, that, if it pleaſed his Majeſty to accept it, he would take upon him the ſuffering of thoſe puniſhments which were due from him to man, and the performance of thoſe duties which were due from man to him; ſo that whatſoever he ſhould thus humble himſelf to do or ſuffer, ſhould wholly be on the account of man, &c.

This motion the Father, out of the riches of his grace and mercy, was pleaſed to conſent unto, &c. So that Chriſt may be looked upon not only as a Surety, but as a party in this covenant of grace; being not only bound to God, but likewiſe covenanting with him for us.

Chr. Lib. vol. XLVII p 53, 62.

This I believe to be all true, all agreeable to the oracles of God [H].

MR.

That there never was any ſuch Covenant between God the Father and God the Son for Man's redemption.

HOW does it appear that Chriſt undertook this before the foundation of the world, and *that* by a poſitive covenant between him and the Father?

The texts you have brought do by no means prove, that there ever was any ſuch covenant made between the Father and the Son.

Here is no mention of any covenant, nor any thing from which it can be inferred. I ſee not one word of the treaty itſelf, nor can I poſſibly allow the exiſtence of it, without far other proof than this.

I deny the aſſertion that God made the new covenant with Chriſt, as being one of the central points in which Calviniſm and Antinomianiſm meet.

Letter to Mr. Hervey.

[The reader is deſired to turn to the note, p. 81, where he will find Mr. Weſley, by his own confeſſion, in the very center of Calviniſm and Antinomianiſm.]

I have read them (the Scriptures referred to by Mr. Hervey) but cannot find a word about this grand treaty. *Ib.*

I Won-

[H] If the Chriſtian Library be (as Mr. Weſley affirms) *all true, all agreeable to the word of God*, then what are we to think of his other works?

That Mr. Weſley holds Free-will.

MR. F—r tells Mr. Shirley, (2d Check, p. 37.) that when he maintained the freedom of the will, Jeſus Chriſt and the Goſpel were on his ſide, &c. &c.

To this alſo, Mr. Weſley gives his imprimatur. In the mean while his ſermons and Chriſtian Library continue upon ſale, and bear their joint teſtimony againſt the author of the Preſervative, and againſt the Vindicator; as what ſtands on the oppoſite ſide plainly demonſtrates.

That Mr. Weſley wonders how any Man can hold Free-will.

I Wonder as much at the doctrine that ſome men have advanced concerning *free-will*, as at that which others have broached in favor of good works, &c. And THIS MY FAITH IS NOT GROUNDED ON A ROVING FANCY, but on the moſt ſolid reaſons. Foraſmuch as of ourſelves we are not able in our underſtandings to diſcern the evil from the good, much leſs then are we able in our wills to prefer the good before the evil, the will never ſettling upon any thing but what the judgment diſcovers to it.

Chriſt. Lib. vol. XLVII. p. 57.

Again, Such is the freedom of man's will, free only to evil, free to drink iniquity like water. *Sermon on Rom.* viii. 15.

AN- THE

works? If one contain the ſincere milk of the word, the other muſt neceſſarily be an adulteration of man's deviſing.

The ſame may be ſaid concerning the Minutes, and the two Vindications of them: If theſe be truly orthodox, upwards of forty volumes of the Chriſtian Library muſt be thoroughly heterodox; and then I am ſure, there is great reaſon to lament that ſo many poor peoples pockets ſhould be fleeced, for that which can never do their ſouls any manner of good. Certainly the purchaſe of a little tea, or ſnuff, is an offence of a much lighter nature, than the expending ſo much money for ſo many BAD books (to uſe Mr. Weſley's own expreſſion concerning Mr. Hervey's eleven excellent Letters); and therefore, whilſt he perſiſts in recommending Mr. F——r's publications, it would be but common juſtice to caution his hearers againſt the Chriſtian Library, and to return them what they have paid for it. Surely, I might, with great juſtice, adopt that language to Mr. Weſley upon this occaſion, which Mr. F——r, with much unkindneſs, uſes to Mr. Shirley,

That our Sin is Imputed to Christ, and Christ's Righteousness to us.

ANOTHER expression I find in II Cor. v. 21, *As Christ was made sin for us, who knew no sin, so are we made the righteousness of God in him:* That is, though Christ was a man without sin himself, yet our sin was imputed to him, and he was by God reckoned as a sinner; and then he kills him, putting our curse upon him; so to us that are free from righteousness Christ is made righteousness; so that God looks on us as if we had performed perfect righteousness, and when that is done he saves us.

Christ. Lib. vol. I. p. 231.

II Cor. v. 21. As he is said to be *made sin for us*, so we are said to be *made righteousness in him:* But what righteousness? our own? No, the righteousness of God, radically his, imputatively ours: And this is the only way whereby we are said to be made the righteousness of God, even by the Righteousness of Christ being made ours; by which we are accounted righteous before God.

Christ. Lib. vol. XLVII. p. 54.

That our Sin is not Imputed to Christ, nor Christ's Righteousness to us.

THE next Scripture that is urged is II Cor. v. 21, *He hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.* From hence they infer, that as our sins are imputed to Christ, so Christ's Righteousness or active obedience is imputed to us. Of all the Scriptures which they take up, Mr. Gataker hath well observed, this is the most clear against themselves. There is no footing in this Scripture for the inference drawn from it; here is nothing said touching any imputation of our sins to Christ; and consequently, nothing to build a reciprocal imputation of his righteousness to us [1].

Treatise on Just. p. 173.

Shirley, when he addresses him upon giving up his late sermons; "That these books, publicly exposed to sale, and bought perhaps by "thousands, are, in one sense, no more his own; they belong to the "purchasers;" who (if the Minutes, the Vindication, and the Second Check are true) have certainly and literally *spent their money for that which is not bread.*

[1] Mr. Wesley's note on this very same text runs as follows.

That

That both Adam's Sin and Chriſt's Righteouſneſs are Imputed.

AS Adam's firſt unrighteouſneſs, the firſt ſin he committed, is communicated to men, and made theirs by imputation; and not only ſo, but by inherency alſo (for it hath bred in them original ſin); after the ſame manner, the righteouſneſs that Chriſt wrought is made ours by imputation; and this imputative Righteouſneſs of Chriſt worketh a righteouſneſs which is inherent in us.

Mr. Weſley's Chriſt. Lib. vol. IX. p. 230.

This I believe to be all true, all agreeable to the oracles of God; all intelligible to plain men. This is the gold which I have extracted out of baſer mixtures. This I look upon to be one of the choiceſt pieces of practical divinity that has been publiſhed in the Engliſh tongue.

Title and Pref. to Chriſt. Lib.

That neither Adam's Sin nor Chriſt's Righteouſneſs are Imputed.

THE Scripture no where affirms either the imputation of Adam's ſin to his poſterity, or of the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt to thoſe that believe.

Either to ſay that the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is imputed to his poſterity of believers, or the ſin of Adam to his, are both expreſſions unknown to the Holy Ghoſt in the Scriptures. There is neither word, nor ſyllable, nor letter, nor tittle of any ſuch thing to be found there.

Treatiſe on Juſtification, p. 101, 103.

The concluſion reſulting from theſe particulars is, that neither the imputation of Adam's ſin or of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs have any footing either in reaſon or religion. *Ibid.* p. 108.

This I believe to be the *real Scripture doctrine.*

Mr. Weſley's Pref. to the Treat. on Juſtification.

I Might now draw a contraſt concerning Mr. Weſley's notions of juſtifying faith, whether or no it can exiſt without the knowledge of it, or without aſſurance; and might animadvert on thoſe ſtrange aſſertions of his, *That it is often a long time after a man is juſtified, before Chriſt is formed in his heart*; and that *he believes it ſound divinity, agreeable to Scripture and experience,*

That we might be made the righteouſneſs of God in him.—Might thro' him be inveſted with that Righteouſneſs, FIRST IMPUTED, then implanted in us, which is in every ſenſe the Righteouſneſs of God.

Mr. Weſley on the New Teſtament.

experience, that *a ſoul may be juſtified who has not the in-dwelling of the ſpirit* [K]. But as my book is already ſwelled much beyond its intended ſize, I muſt avoid all poſſible prolixity.

That Suffering the Penalty is not all the Law requires.

SUffering the penalty is not what the law primarily requireth; for the law of God requires perfect obedience, the penalty being only threatened to, not properly required of the breakers of it: For let a man ſuffer the penalty of the law in never ſo high a manner, he is not therefore accounted obedient to it; his puniſhment doth not ſpeak his innocence, but rather his tranſgreſſion of the law.

Chriſt. Lib. vol. XLVII. p. 55.

That Suffering the Penalty is all the Law requires.

IN caſe a man hath tranſgreſſed the law, and ſuffered (whether by himſelf or ſome other for him) the full puniſhment of it, he is no farther a debtor to it, either in point of obedience or of puniſhment, nor hath any thing to do with the law more or leſs for his juſtification; becauſe the puniſhment which hath been ſo ſuffered, is of equal conſideration to the law with the moſt abſolute conformity to it's precepts.

Treat. on Juſt. p. 195.

For the Doctrine of Merit.

AS to *merit* itſelf, of which we have been ſo dreadfully afraid, we are rewarded according to our works, yea, becauſe of our works. How does this differ from, for the ſake of our works? And how differs this from *ſecundum merita operum*, as OUR WORKS DESERVE? Can you ſplit the hair? I doubt I cannot.

Minutes of 1770.

MR.

Againſt the Doctrine of Merit.

THERE is NO MERIT but in the blood of Chriſt.

Mr. Weſley's Serm. vol. I. p. 249.

[Salvation is] "not by the "merit of works," &c.

Minutes of 1770.

There is nothing we are, or have, or do, which can DESERVE the leaſt thing at God's hands.

Mr. Weſley's Serm. vol. I. p. 3.

IN

[K] Principles of a Methodiſt.

For a Twofold Juſtification.

MR. Shirley having expreſſed his thankfulneſs to God, that Mr. Weſley and his preachers do not hold the doctrine of a ſecond Juſtification by works, the Vindicator begs him to reſerve his public praiſes for a more proper occaſion; tells him, he wrongs Mr. Weſley and his preachers; and having, in pretty warm terms, DEFIED Mr. Shirley to produce, out of Mr. Weſley's declaration, one ſingle word or tittle denying or excluding a ſecond Juſtification by works; gives it under his own hand, that if Mr. Weſley and his preachers had really denied the doctrine of a ſecond Juſtification by works, one ſtep more would have carried them into Dr. Criſp's eternal Juſtification, which is the very center of Antinomianiſm; and without waiting the return of the next conference, he would have borne his *legal* teſtimony againſt their Antinomian error [L]. All this Mr. Weſley reviſes and corrects; and to all this he gives his imprimatur, and recommends the purchaſe of it to his hearers. In the mean while his Journals continue to be expoſed to ſale, from one of which I have extracted that which ſtands in the oppoſite column.

MR.

Againſt a Twofold Juſtification.

IN the afternoon I was informed how many wiſe and learned men, who cannot in terms deny it, becauſe our articles and homilies are not yet repealed, explain juſtification by faith.

They ſay, Firſt, Juſtification is twofold; the *firſt* in this life; the *ſecond* at the laſt day, &c. &c.

In flat oppoſition to this I cannot but maintain, (at leaſt till I have a clearer light) that the juſtification ſpoken of by St. Paul to the Romans, and in our articles, IS NOT TWOFOLD. IT IS ONE AND NO MORE.

Jour. 1739 *to* 1741, *reprinted* 1769.

[Now (to uſe Mr. F——r's expreſſion) I think a man muſt not only be *a bold metaphyſician*, but a *magician* indeed, who can prove, that ONE AND NO MORE, means TWO AND NO LESS.]

MR.

[L] See Second Check, p. 2.

That Works are a Condition of Juſtification.

MR. Weſley, in his Minutes of 1770, ſpeaking of our juſtification and acceptance with God, ſaith, that ſalvation is "not by the merit of works, but by works as a CONDITION."

Minutes of 1770.

We have received it as a maxim, that a man is to do nothing in order to juſtification. Nothing can be more falſe: Whoever deſires to find favor with God ſhould ceaſe from evil, and learn to do well. Whoever repents ſhould do works meet for repentance; and if this be not in order to find favor, what does he do them for?

Ibid.

That Works are not a Condition of Juſtification.

MR. Weſley, in his Journal from Aug. 12, to Nov. 1769, p. 81, thus ſpeaks; "I believe no works can "be previous to juſtification, "NOR CONSEQUENTLY "A CONDITION OF IT."

Again, The CONDITION of our acceptance with God is not our holineſs, either of heart or life.

Pref. to Hymns.

If a man could poſſibly be made holy before he was juſtified, it would entirely ſet his juſtification aſide; ſeeing he could not, in the very nature of the thing, be juſtified, if he were not at that very time ungodly.

Mr. Weſley's note on Rom. iv. 5.

Whoſoever thou art who deſireſt to be forgiven and reconciled to the favor of God, do not ſay in thine heart, *I muſt firſt do this:* Knoweſt thou not, that thou canſt do nothing but ſin till thou art reconciled.

Mr. Weſley's Serm. vol. I. p. 119.

We allow that God juſtifies the ungodly; him that till that hour is totally ungodly; full of all evil, void of all good. 2dly, That he juſtifies the ungodly that worketh not, that till that moment worketh no goodneſs; neither can he; for an evil tree cannot bring forth good fruit.

Sermons, vol. III. p. 111.

That Mr. Weſley never adopted Mr. Law's ſcheme.

IT is aſſerted, that Mr. Law's ſyſtem was "The Creed "of the Methodiſts." But it is not proved. I had been eight years at Oxford before I read any of Mr. Law's writings; and when I did, I was ſo far from making them my creed, that I had objections to almoſt every page.

Principles of a Methodiſt.

MR.

That Mr. Weſley highly approves of Mr. Law.

ONE recovering from a dangerous illneſs, deſired to be inſtructed in the nature of the Lord's Supper. I thought it concerned her to be firſt inſtructed in the nature of Chriſtianity; and, accordingly, fixed an hour a day to read with her in Mr. Law's Treatiſe on Chriſtian Perfection.

Journal from Oct. 1735 to Sept. 1738, p. 4.

Again, Wed. July 6, another little company of us met. We ſung, read a little of Mr. Law, and then converſed [M].

Ibid. p. 20.

BY

[M] But how agrees all this with what Mr. Weſley ſays in his Journal, from Feb. 1738, till his return from Germany, p. 27.

"I declare, in my cool judgment, and in the preſence of the moſt "high God, that I believe the myſtic writers to be one great Anti-"Chriſt."

According to this ſolemn declaration, inſtead of inſtructing the poor dying woman in the *true nature of Chriſtianity*, he was propping her up in the deluſions of Anti-Chriſt.

Again, If Solomon be *the greateſt of Myſtics*, as Mr. F——r affirms, (and Mr. Weſley acquieſces in the affirmation) and if the myſtic writers (collectively) are *one great Anti-Chriſt*; then, if there be any meaning in words, do not Mr. Weſley, and the Vindicator together, make it out that Solomon is the head of this great body of Anti-Chriſt, as clearly as, in another place, we ſhall ſee that they concur in proving Solomon to be the *chief of ſoul-deſtroying poiſoners*. But whether the *Myſtic writers* be *one great Anti-Chriſt* or not, it is certain, that Mr. Weſley (ſince this declaration) has publiſhed many extracts from them, for the edification of his readers, not only out of Mr. Law's works (to every page of which he ſays he objects) but even out of that famous *French Myſtic* Madam Bourignon.

For a Single Life.

MR. Weſley, in his Journal from 1762 to 1765, printed an. 1768, p. 102, ſays, that his *Thoughts on a ſingle life* are juſt the ſame they have been theſe thirty years [N].

Againſt a Single Life.

BY what unaccountable accident was Mr. Weſley perſuaded to marry, after writing theſe *Thoughts on a ſingle life!*

That wearing no gay coloured cloaths, made in the height of the faſhion, will increaſe our reward, and brighten our crown in Heaven.

LET a ſingle intention to pleaſe God preſcribe both what cloathing you ſhall buy, and the manner wherein it ſhall be made, and how you ſhall put it on, and wear it, &c. ſo that, conſequently, it may increaſe your reward, and brighten your crown in heaven. *Wear nothing of a glaring* COLOUR, or which is in any kind gay, gliſtening, ſhowy; *nothing made in the very height of the faſhion.*

Advice to the people called Methodiſts, with regard to dreſs.

MR.

That to mind the faſhion or colour of our apparel, is mere ſuperſtition,

TO make it a point of conſcience to differ from others, as to the SHAPE or COLOUR of your apparel, is mere ſuperſtition.

Mr. Weſley's Letter to a Perſon lately joined with the people called Quakers.

MR.

[N] Mr. Weſley, in theſe Thoughts, an edition of which, reprinted in 1770, is before me, gives the following reaſons for celibacy: "That "we may employ every hour in what we judge to be the moſt excel- "lent way; but, if we were married, we muſt aſk leave of our compa- "nion,

For Baptiſm by Sprinkling.

MR. Weſley, in his Preſervative againſt Unſettled Notions in Religion, treating upon Baptiſm, ſays, "As there is no clear proof of "DIPPING in Scripture, ſo "there is very probable proof "of the contrary."

With regard to the mode of baptizing, I would only add, *Chriſt no where, as far as I can find, requires* DIPPING, but only *baptizing*; which word many moſt eminent for learning and piety have declared ſignifies to *pour on*, or *ſprinkle*, as well as to *dip*. As our Lord has graciouſly given us a word of ſuch extenſive meaning, doubtleſs the parent, (or the perſon to be baptized if he be adult) ought to chooſe which way he beſt approves. What God has left indifferent, it becomes not man to make neceſſary.

Thoughts on Infant Bapt. p. 19.

For Baptiſm by Dipping.

MR. Weſley has lately been put in mind, that when he baptized a certain gentlewoman, Mrs. L. S. he DIPPED her ſo heartily, and held her ſo long under water in a bathing-tub, that her friends ſcreamed out, thinking ſhe had been drowned; and it was with much difficulty ſhe recovered the operation.

Mr. Toplady's letter to Mr. Weſley.

Wedneſday, May 5, I was aſked to baptize a child of Mr. Parker, ſecond bailiff of Savannah; but Mrs. Parker told me, neither Mr. P. nor I will conſent to it's being DIPPED. I anſwered, "If you certify "that your child is weak, it "will ſuffice (the rubric ſays) "to pour water upon it." She replied, "Nay, the child is "not weak; but I am reſolv-"ed it ſhall not be *dipped*." This argument I could not confute; ſo I went home, and the child was baptized by another perſon.

Journ. from Oct. 1735 *to Feb.* 1737-8.

"nion, otherwiſe what complaints or diſguſts would follow." "And how hard is it," ſays he, "even to know how far you ought to give "way for peace ſake, and where to ſtop." He exhorts the unmarried to prize the advantages they enjoy; to know the value of them; to eſteem them as highly while they have them, as others do after they have loſt them. He adviſes, that we ſhould pray againſt marriage; and concludes with, "Bleſſed are they who have made "themſelves eunuchs for the kingdom of Heaven's ſake." I only give Mr. Weſley's own words, and make no remarks upon them.

Mr. Weſley

Mr. Weſley is no ſtranger to a certain gentleman who publiſhed a Treatiſe againſt Tea-drinking, as being highly pernicious both to ſoul and body; and drew up a familiar catechiſm in that Treatiſe for the uſe of ſuch as were preſſed to drink tea. And does not he alſo know, that the writer of this treatiſe (who indeed is no other perſon than himſelf) re-commenced a tea-drinker, after he had expatiated on the benefits which he found from leaving off tea, and after he had told the readers of the Treatiſe, that he himſelf would be the firſt to ſet them the example in that piece of ſelf-denial?—This Treatiſe is lately reprinted, and ſold at the Foundery, and in Weſt-ſtreet, London, Price One Penny.

That Enoch and Elijah are in Heaven.

ENOCH and Elijah entered at once into the higheſt degree of glory, without firſt waiting in Paradiſe.

Notes on the New Teſt. John iii. 13, *1ſt edition, publiſhed an.* 1755.

That Enoch and Elijah are not in Heaven.

ENOCH and Elijah are not in heaven, but only in Paradiſe.

Note on Rev. xix. 20.

That St. Paul ſpeaks of the Law as a Perſon.

THE law is here ſpoken of by a common figure, as A PERSON, to which, as to an huſband, life and death are aſcribed.

Mr. Weſley's notes on the New Teſt. Rom. vii. 1.

THE

That St. Paul does not ſpeak of the Law as a Perſon.

THIS way of ſpeaking of the law as A PERSON injured, and to be ſatisfied, ſeems hardly defenſible.

Preſervative againſt Unſettled Notions in Religion.

DOES

For a Juſtified State.

THE STATE of a juſtified perſon is inexpreſſibly great and glorious.

Serm. on 2 Cor. v. 17.

Againſt a Juſtified State.

DOES not talking of a juſtified or ſanctified STATE tend to miſlead men?

Minutes of 1770.

That they who are once juſtified are juſtified for ever.

CHRIST continues a prieſt for ever, ſo we continue to be juſtified for ever. There is hereby a full ſecurity given us of juſtification to be continued for ever [O].

Chriſt. Lib. vol. II. p. 167.

MR.

That they who are *at leaſt* once juſtified may become total Apoſtates.

CHRIST died for him alſo (a wilful, total apoſtate) and he was at leaſt juſtified once.

Mr. Weſley's note on Heb. x. 29.

WHY

[O] The great comfort ariſing to a believer from this doctrine, is well expreſſed by Mr. Weſley in his Chriſtian Library, vol. XXXVI. p. 87.

" Faith ſhould eye Chriſt as hanging upon the croſs, and offering " up himſelf, through the eternal ſpirit, a ſacrifice to ſatisfy divine " juſtice for all our ſins. We cannot think that Chriſt bore but ſome " of our ſins, or only ſins committed before converſion; and if he " bore all, as the father laid all upon him, the believer is to lay hold on " him by faith, as hanging on the croſs, as well for taking away the " guilt of ſins committed after converſion as before. This ſacrifice " was a ſacrifice for all, and he bare our ſins without diſtinction or " exemption, in his own body on the tree."

In this one excellent paſſage, Mr. Weſley maintains the whole of the doctrine inſiſted on in my fourth Letter in anſwer to Mr. F——r's firſt Vindication.

That Mr. Weſley does not approve the expreſſion, "Why "me."

MR. F—r affirms, Vind. p. 16. (and Mr. Weſley gives his *Imprimatur*) "that he never heard Mr. Weſley make uſe of that expreſſion, *Why me?* leſt he ſhould be *wiſe above what is written*; and becauſe Mr. Weſley doubts whether he can ſay, *Why me? Why me?* without a ſecret touch of the ſelf-applauſe that tickles the Phariſee's heart, &c. and therefore he leaves the faſhionable exclamation to others [P]."

That Mr. Weſley does approve the expreſſion, "Why "me."

WHY haſt thou to thy people join'd
Me, the vileſt of mankind,
In cordial charity?
Why haſt thou heard the ſpirit's groans,
Intreating in thy choſen ones,
For *me*, O God, for *me?*
Mr. Weſley's Hymns, vol. I. p. 190.

Againſt Myſticiſm.

I Declare, in my cool judgment, and in the preſence of the moſt high God, that I believe the myſtic writers to be one great Anti-Chriſt; that they do not teach the truth, as as it is in Jeſus; and that their doctrine is poiſonous.

See the extracts from Mr. Weſley, p. 141, 150.

I THINK

For Myſticiſm.

IF you think *Myſticiſm* is intrinſically bad, you are under a miſtake. One of the greateſt myſtics, next to Solomon, is Thomas à Kempis.—The Myſticiſm of the Canticles is worthy our deepeſt attention.

Second Check, p. 33, 34, reviſed by Mr. Weſley.

WE

[P] I cannot help thinking, that Mr. Weſley would have given a much more genuine proof of real humility, and of his diſlike to having his heart a *little tickled*, by ſtriking out of Mr. F——r's manuſcript ſome of thoſe fulſome expreſſions relative to himſelf, than he does by refuſing the Phraſe, *Why me?* At leaſt, there is certainly ſome danger of *refined pride*, and the *ſecret touches of ſelf-applauſe*, whilſt he is recommending from the pulpit a book which holds himſelf forth as *the moſt venerable ambaſſador of Chriſt*, and as *the greateſt miniſter Mr. F——r knows.*

That Mr. Weſley is a thorough CALVINIST in the point of Juſtification.

I THINK on Juſtification juſt as I have done any time theſe ſeven and twenty years; and juſt as Mr. CALVIN does. In this reſpect, I do not differ from him an hair's breadth.

Journal from Oct. 1762, *to May* 17, 1765, p. 115.

I have, during this whole time, (ſince the year 1738) occaſionally uſed thoſe expreſſions Imputed Righteouſneſs, the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, and others of the ſame kind; but it is equally true, that I never uſed them at all in any other meaning than that ſound ſcriptural one, wherein they are uſed by many eminent men, Mr. CALVIN in particular.

Mr. Weſley's Anſwer to all that is material in Mr. Hervey's Letters, prefixed to his Treatiſe on Juſtification.

That Mr. Weſley has leaned too much towards CALVINISM in this point.

WE ſaid, in the year 1744, we have leaned too much towards CALVINISM. *Min. of* 1770.

[It appears from the whole ſcope of the Minutes, that this leaning too much towards CALVINISM was in the matter of Juſtification.]

For CALVIN to aſcribe one opinion to Paul in the point of Juſtification, and to be himſelf of another, is neither better nor worſe than to profeſs himſelf wiſer than him, yea, than the Holy Ghoſt ſpeaking by him.

Treat. on Juſt. p. 198.

I conclude this contraſt with the following quotation, with which Mr. Weſley ends his Preſervative againſt Unſettled Notions in Religion.

WHEREAS we are ſurrounded on every ſide by enemies, &c. &c. "It would be therefore well for you carefully to read over the foregoing Preſervative, together with *Serious Thoughts concerning Perſeverance, and Predeſtination calmly Conſidered.* And when you are maſters of them yourſelves, it will be eaſy for you to recommend and explain them to our ſocieties; that they may *no more be caſt to and fro by every wind of doctrine*; but, BEING SETTLED IN ONE MIND AND ONE JUDGMENT, BY SOLID SCRIPTURAL AND RATIONAL ARGUMENTS, *may grow up in all things into Him who is our head, even* Jeſus Chriſt."

CONCLUSION.

THUS have I at length brought this extraordinary FARRAGO to a concluſion; not becauſe I could not find any more inconſiſtencies to have lengthened it, but becauſe I am really tired of tranſcribing them.

To follow Mr. Weſley in the exact order in which he publiſhes and ſells his contradictions, would not be an eaſy matter. I ſhall, therefore, only obſerve, in general, that his Extract from Biſhop Beveridge's Thoughts on Religion is flatly contradicted, for two hundred pages together, in his edition of John Goodwin's Treatiſe on Juſtification. Again, This Treatiſe is flatly contradicted by his Sermon on *Jer.* xxiii. 6. And this again is contradicted by his letter to Mr. Hervey, in his *Preſervative againſt Unſettled Notions in Religion*, &c. This Preſervative is itſelf contradicted, over and over, and over again, in his Abſtract from Dr. Preſton's *Breaſt-plate of Faith and Love.* And this Abſtract from Dr. Preſton is flatly contradicted by his edition of Baxter's *Aphoriſms*; and theſe *Aphoriſms* are flatly contradicted by what he has publiſhed out of Biſhop Beveridge's *Private Thoughts on Religion*; and theſe *Thoughts* of Biſhop Beveridge are again flatly contradicted by Mr. Weſley's own *Thoughts on Imputed Righteouſneſs.*——Thus the wheel runs round and round again; and yet Mr. Weſley aſks, in his Preface to Goodwin's book, "Whence ariſes this whole "charge of inconſiſtency and ſelf-contradiction? Merely from "ſtraining, winding to and fro, and diſtorting a few inno-"cent words. For wherein have I contradicted myſelf, tak-"ing words in their unforced, natural conſtruction, or even "changed my judgment, in any one reſpect, with regard to Juſ-"tification, ſince I printed the ſermon on Salvation by Faith in "the year 1738?" But ſurely it would have been a queſtion much eaſier reſolved, "Wherein have I NOT contradicted myſelf?"

Mr. Weſley's wavering diſpoſition is not an affair of yeſterday. He muſt well remember with what plainneſs his faithful companion, Mr. Delamotte, ſpoke to him on this head more

more than thirty years ago; and endeavoured to convince him, that he was not on the right foundation [Q]. All his Journals and Tracts are replete with proofs of his having been toſſed from one opinion, and from one ſyſtem, to another, from the time of his ordination to the preſent moment; and he himſelf cannot but acknowledge, that both his friends and foes, whether German or Engliſh, have accuſed him of his unſettled principles in religion. He knows full well, if he will abide by his own declarations, that after having *erred, not knowing the Scriptures*, in the way of *Myſticiſm*, which he juſtly accounts to be a ſcheme of juſtification by man's inward righteouſneſs [R], he "*wandered many years in the new path of ſalvation by faith* "*and works*," till about the year 1738; when "*it pleaſed God* "*to ſhew him the old way of ſalvation, by faith only* [S]." At this time he publiſhed his ſermon on *Salvation by Faith*; which, he affirms, is the only doctrine "that can prevent the increaſe of "the Romiſh deluſion among us," and is, "as our Church "juſtly calls it, the ſtrong rock and foundation of the Chriſ-"tian religion [T]." Some time after this, he tells us, he became rather too *ſcrupulous* about uſing the word CONDITION; and, in the year 1744, *leaned too much towards Calviniſm*. This conſequence of this was, that *Calviniſm* and *Antinomianiſm* began to be ſynonimous terms, both in his writing and preaching; and, under the convoy of *that illuſtrious divine, John Arminius* [U], *the white devil of ſelf-righteouſneſs*, (to uſe Luther's expreſſion) *came in like a flood*; inſomuch that, in his laſt Journal, he fairly gives up the neceſſity of a clear belief of the doctrine of Juſtification by faith alone, and thinks it high time to throw it aſide, as *ampullas & ſeſquipedalia verba*; though, in the year 1738, he thought it the only barrier againſt Popery and licentiouſneſs [X]; yea, the good *old way* which *it had pleaſed God to ſhew him after his many years wanderings*. And, as if this were not ſufficient, in his Minutes of 1770, he not only goes back to the mark from whence he firſt ſet out; but, as I have proved in the laſt edition of my Five Letters in anſwer to Mr. F——r, abſolutely makes man's righteouſneſs to be the procuring cauſe of his acceptance with

---

[Q] Journ. from Aug. 1738 to Nov. 1739, p. 14.
[R] Pref. to Hymns and Sacred Poems. vol. I. printed at London.
[S] Journ. from Nov. 1739, to Sept. 1741, p. 41.
[T] Serm. on Salvation by Faith.
[U] Vide Mr F——r's Vindication.
[X] Serm. on Salvation by Faith.

God;

God; and his ſalvation, from firſt to laſt, to depend upon the intrinſic merit of his own unaſſiſted works. So that, I preſume, Mr. Weſley is now got to his *ne plus ultra*; eſpecially as he ſo cordially acquieſces in Mr. F——r's ſentiments, that Solomon is "*the chief of Myſtics*," (conſequently, that Myſticiſm is the religion of the Bible,) after having ſo many years condemned it as the eſſence of ſelf-righteouſneſs, yea, as what *cauſed him to err, not knowing the Scriptures, neither the power of God*; and after having ſolemnly affirmed, in the preface to the Hymns and Sacred Poems, that he *believed himſelf indiſpenſibly obliged, in the preſence of God, and angels and men, to declare, that he apprehended the myſtic writers did not teach the truth as it is in Jeſus, and that they laid another foundation*, viz. that of acceptance *for our virtuous habits or tempers, thereby placing the ground of our acceptance in ourſelves, and ſuppoſing that we are to be juſtified for the ſake of our inward righteouſneſs*. Whereas, (ſays Mr. Weſley, like a good ſound Proteſtant,) "The ſole cauſe of our acceptance with God is "the Righteouſneſs and Death of Chriſt, who fulfilled God's "law, and died in our ſtead."

"Other foundation, therefore (ſays he) can no man lay, "without being an adverſary to Chriſt and his goſpel, than "faith alone; faith, though neceſſarily producing both, yet not "including either good works or holineſs [X]."

But ſtill Solomon is the chief of Myſtics; yea, even though Mr. Weſley, in his Journal from 1762 to 1765, calls *Myſticiſm* POISONOUS DOCTRINE, *which had well nigh extinguiſhed the laſt ſpark of life at Cardiff*. So that if poor Solomon be *the chief of Myſtics*, and Myſticiſm be poiſonous doctrine, by the plaineſt rules of logic, Mr. Weſley has now as clearly made out Solomon to be THE CHIEF OF LIFE-EXTINGUISHING POISONERS, as (p. 141) we have ſeen that he proved him to be the head of *the body of Anti-Chriſt*. Yet this is the gentleman who wonders he ſhould be thought inconſiſtent, or ſelf-contradictory!

I expect you will tell me, Sir, that I have expoſed Mr. Weſley, particularly in the foregoing contraſt. That Mr. Weſley is expoſed I allow; but that I have expoſed him I deny.—Out of Mr. Weſley's own mouth all that I have brought againſt him proceeds.

And here, Sir, I muſt beg to call in a witneſs, to whom you cannot have the leaſt objection, having before ſummoned

---

[X] Preſ. to Hymns and Sacred Poems.

him

him yourſelf to confute the *ignorance* of Mr. Shirley in the matter of a ſecond juſtification by works. I mean your own pariſhioner, Curſing Tom the Collier. Perhaps he might not underſtand me if I were to aſk him, "Whether the ſame holy Spirit could ever lead a man both to believe and to deny Imputed Righteouſneſs, Sinleſs Perfection, &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. And, if in the one caſe he acted as the ſpirit of truth, muſt he not, in the other, neceſſarily act as the ſpirit of deluſion?" But if I were to ſay to the Collier, "Prithee, Tom, tell me what thou ſhouldſt think of a miniſter who ſays and unſays for forty years together, and yet will never own he has once contradicted himſelf?" Tom, though neither *metaphyſician* nor *magician*, might readily anſwer, "Why, Sir, if I may plainly give my opinion "of that clergyman who has ſaid and unſaid for ſo many years "together, he may, for't I know, be often right, but, (whe-"ther he will own it or not) though I am no ſcholar, I "am ſure the gentleman muſt alſo be often wrong." Thus, Sir, the moſt ignorant collier in your pariſh can immediately ſee Mr. Weſley's inconſiſtency with himſelf. And indeed, the more he publiſhes, and the more he preaches, the more evident is that obſervation of Mr. Hervey concerning him, "It is ſaid of Iſhmael, his hand is againſt every man; but "Mr. Weſley goes one ſtep farther, for his hand is againſt "himſelf."

However, this is the more to be lamented, as no man in the world has ever written more ſtrikingly againſt inconſiſtency than Mr. Weſley; particularly in his ſermon on a Catholic Spirit, where he ſays, page 15, "A Catholic Spirit is not "Speculative Latitudinarianiſm; it is not an indifference to all "opinions.—This is *the ſpawn of Hell*, not the offspring of "Heaven. This unſettledneſs of thought, this being driven "to and fro, and toſſed about with every wind of doctrine, "is a great curſe, not a bleſſing; an irreconcilable enemy, "not a true Catholiciſm. A man of a true Catholic ſpirit "has not now his religion to ſeek. HE IS FIXED AS THE "SUN IN HIS JUDGMENT, CONCERNING THE "MAIN BRANCHES OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. "It is true, he is always ready to hear and weigh whatſoever "can be offered againſt his principles. But, as this does not "ſhew any wavering in his own mind, ſo neither does it occa-"ſion any. He does not halt between two opinions, nor vainly "endeavour to blend them into one. Obſerve this: you

"who

" who know not what ſpirit you are of, who call yourſelves " men of a Catholic ſpirit, only becauſe you are of a muddy " underſtanding; becauſe your mind is all in a miſt; becauſe " you have no ſettled, conſiſtent principles, but are for jum- " bling all opinions together. Be convinced, that you have " quite miſſed your way; you know not where you are. You " think you are got into the very ſpirit of Chriſt; when, in " truth, you are nearer the ſpirit of Anti-Chriſt. Go, firſt, " and learn the firſt elements of the Goſpel of Chriſt; and " then ſhall you learn to be of a truly Catholic ſpirit [Y]."

It

[Y] Though this ſermon be entitled " *Catholic Spirit*," yet one of it's heads is to inculcate an attendance upon only one congregation; in other words, " Hear me, and thoſe I ſend out, and no- " body elſe." But if this be true *Catholic Spirit*, we may well aſk, Why Chriſt has given diverſity of gifts to divers miniſters for the edification of his body the Church? And I know not how Mr. Weſley will reſolve the queſtion, but by ſaying, that all theſe gifts center in himſelf. However, it is by ſtratagems of this ſort that he holds ſo many ſouls in his own ſhackles, and prevents them from coming to the knowledge of all the glorious truths of the Goſpel; whilſt his allies ſtrengthen the deception by making his followers believe, that his doctrine is that of all the good old divines, whether Puritan or Churchmen, that have preceded him: and this falſe ſtate of the caſe is ſtill farther confirmed by Mr. Weſley's publiſhing their books, and taking out and interpolating as ſhall make them ſpeak his own language. And here, beſides the mangled work he has made with poor Bunyan, and others, I cannot help informing my readers, that in the Life of Mr. Philip Henry, publiſhed in his Chriſtian Library, he has artfully left out Mr. Henry's Confeſſion of Faith at his ordination; which confeſſion being purely Calviniſtical and Evangelical, Mr. Weſley did not chooſe to have it known how widely he differed from this excellent divine.

But what is all this in compariſon of the liberties Mr. Weſley has taken with the Bible itſelf, in order to make it ſpeak conformably to his own favourite tenets. In the ſecond edition of his Notes on the New Teſtament, now on my table, he has abſolutely expunged the word *all* out of the Sacred Text (James iii. 2.) and, inſtead of *in many things we offend all*, writes, " *in many things we offend*;" and then makes a reference to the pronoun *we*, as if it related to men in general, and not to the Apoſtle James, or thoſe to whom he addreſſes himſelf under the name of brethren. Upon ſeeing this, I immediately turned to my Greek Teſtament, and there found the word *all*, (απαντες) and the ſubſtantive to which it refers, is plainly αδελφοί μου, my brethren, i. e. *My brethren, you and I, and all of us,*

offend

It is impoſſible for any man to read the foregoing words of Mr. Weſley, without feeling how deeply they come home to the author himſelf; who, to this moment, ſeems to be ſo abſolutely unſettled in every fundamental doctrine of the Goſpel, that no two diſputants in the ſchools can be more oppoſite to each other than he is to himſelf; and ſo I fear he is likely to remain, whilſt he continues to draw lots for his faith, inſtead of coming to God, with the ſimplicity of a little child, to be taught the truth as it is in Jeſus.

But whether Mr. Weſley ever ſhould, or ſhould not, come to the acknowledgment of the truth; yet, indeed, Sir, your unhappy attachment towards him has cauſed you to treat all

---

offend in many things. This little, but ſignificant word *all*, muſt, therefore, have ſtared Mr. Weſley full in the face, when he was pleaſed to ſtrike it out of the chapter. I make no other obſervation upon this proceeding of Mr. Weſley, than, that I wonder he is not afraid thus to trifle with the oracles of God, leaſt that ſentence, Rev. xxii. 18, 19, ſhould be his portion. However, if Mr. Weſley will give it under his hand, that this omiſſion, of the word ALL, was the error of the *Printer*, and not of the *Annotator*, I am very willing to believe him, though there be no mention of this in an *erratum*.

But, ſuppoſing the word *all* to be left out of the text by a miſtake of the Printer, yet, what can be ſaid of ſo evident a perverſion of the Apoſtle's meaning, as in the note of the *firſt* edition, where the word *all* appears in the text. It is as follows: "St. James here, as in ſeveral of "the following verſes, by a common figure of ſpeech, *includes* himſelf: "*We ſhall receive*—WE OFFEND—*we put bits*—*we curſe.*— "NONE OF WHICH (as common ſenſe ſhews) are to be interpreted "either of him, or of the other Apoſtles." Firſt, I would aſk, does the Apoſtle *include* himſelf, that common ſenſe may ſhew us he *excludes* himſelf? Secondly, is the word απαντες, *all*, in the Scriptures, which Mr. Weſley confounds with *we offend?* If not, they do not in the leaſt elucidate the meaning of this particular paſſage, as Mr. Weſley has cited them, but only tend to darken its true ſenſe, in order the better to cover Mr. Weſley's deſign, with relation to his favourite tenet of *Sinleſs Perfection.* However, while language retains its meaning, ſo long will απαντες πταιομεν ſignify, that *we all offend*, and be an exact parallel with Eccl. vii. 20, *There is not a juſt man upon earth that doeth good and ſinneth not.* I might alſo add, that while the conſciences of men are not deceived, but are ſuffered to ſpeak agreeably to ſcripture and experience, ſo long will every man confeſs the truth of the propoſition, απαντες πταιομεν, *we offend all*, as belonging to himſelf.

your Calviniſtic friends with a ſeverity which is, on no pretence, juſtifiable; and though it was highly neceſſary that your conduct, on this occaſion, ſhould be plainly laid before you, yet I am ſenſible, that it was ſcarcely poſſible to do ſo without ſeeming to bear very hard upon you in return; and, if I were to tell you how much you have loſt yourſelf in the eſteem of many exemplary Chriſtians, by your late publications, (particularly the laſt) you would hardly think that ſo many good men, moſt of whom I am ſure were ſtrongly prejudiced in your favour, could all be miſtaken in their judgment. One of theſe, a reſpectable clergyman, lately ſaid to me, "I ſhould "as ſoon have expected to have ſeen an evangelical pamphlet "from the Pope, as to have ſeen any thing from Mr. F——r "in ſo ſevere a ſpirit." But *it is a ſmall thing to be judged of man's judgment.* I ſhall, therefore, only ſay, May God enable you to lay the matter ſeriouſly to heart; and may he *ſhew you what manner of ſpirit you are of!* But permit me to intreat you not to ſuffer bitter words, and calumnious expreſſions, to diſguiſe themſelves under the appearance of *Swiſs plainneſs*, and *Helvetic bluntneſs*; nor yet to conclude you have never been angry, becauſe ſome condeſcending expreſſions have dropped from your pen; but examine from what ſpring they flow. The only time when ſome controverſial writers ſpeak with any degree of love and kindneſs, is, after they think they have well paid off their antagoniſt, and laid him level to the ground. Then having pretty well vented both the *acid and the bitter*, under the ſelf-pleaſing idea of having obtained the victory, they get into tolerable humour, and are ſo very humble, that they fancy they can, with pleaſure, *lie at the feet* of thoſe whom juſt before they have been belabouring without mercy.——But *the heart is deceitful above all things, and deſperately wicked*; therefore, let you and I, Sir, take heed of this ſnare; for, certain it is, that the pride of conqueſt, ſelf love, and ſelf-flattery, may here find a mantle under which to hide their ugly heads; whilſt the quiet and complacency we experience in our hearts, may proceed from no other cauſe than that which makes a bottle of ſour beer, or of wine upon the fret, become placid and tranquil after it has well vented itſelf, and has been for ſome time uncorked.

Should you think it worth your while to make any reply to theſe Letters, permit me now to inform you, that I have no thoughts of keeping up the controverſy any longer under my real name, or that of Pietas Oxonienſis; but I can venture to aſſure you, that write what you will, or whatever ſide you may

may take, Mr. Weſley himſelf ſhall anſwer you out of his own voluminous works; and I will aſpire to no other honour than that of an editor and tranſcriber.

In the mean while, let me beg to recommend to your peruſal a Letter on Controverſy, which appeared in the Goſpel Magazine for October 1771; it is ſigned *Omicron*; and though written by a Calviniſt, and publiſhed in a performance of which you have no high opinion, yet I promiſe you the peruſal of it will not offend you; and I hope may be of ſignal ſervice. Permit me, however, at preſent to give you the following extract from it.—" The ſcriptural maxim, that the " wrath of man worketh not the Righteouſneſs of God, is " verified by daily obſervation. If our zeal be embittered by " expreſſions of anger, invective or ſcorn, we may think we " are doing ſervice to the cauſe of truth, when, in reality, " we ſhall only bring it into diſcredit. The weapons of our " warfare, and which alone are powerful to break down the " ſtrong holds of error, are not carnal, but ſpiritual; argu- " ments fairly drawn from Scripture and experience, and en- " forced by ſuch a mild addreſs as may perſuade our readers, " that, whether we can convince them or not, we wiſh well " to their ſouls, and contend only for the truth's ſake. If we " can ſatisfy them that we act upon theſe motives, our point " is half gained; they will be more diſpoſed to conſider " calmly what we offer; and if they ſhould ſtill diſſent from " our opinions, they will be conſtrained to approve our in- " tentions."

To this extract permit me to add the following obſervation. For want of coming to a proper *eclairciſſement*, there may be a *ſeeming* difference between two writers in ſome points, when there is no *real* one, at leaſt no *wide* one. Upon this account I would offer a word or two more concerning the doctrine of a Twofold Juſtification, before I take my leave.

1ſt, I believe that every child of God, at his converſion, is freely juſtified by faith alone in Chriſt Jeſus; and yet not by the act of faith, but by faith as an hand or inſtrument whereby Chriſt is received.—Thus far, I believe, WE do not differ at all: and this I think is St. Paul's doctrine, as well as the doctrine of the Reformation, and of our own Church; but how widely it differs from Mr. Weſley's edition of Goodwin on Juſtification, and Mr. Baxter's Aphoriſms, is manifeſt from the paſſages I have cited.

2dly, I believe that every child of God is evidentially or declaratively juſtified (*i. e.* declared to be a juſtified perſon) *by works*,

as well before men here, as before the aſſembled world at the laſt day. Here I do not think we differ much, if at all.

But if you affirm, that there is any the leaſt degree of *merit* in thoſe works which we are enabled to perform by grace after faith received, here we differ as far as eaſt from weſt. And is it not evident, that the maintaining this doctrine of *merit* (in a believer's beſt performances) tends to confound your own diſtinction between juſtification by the *merit* and by the *evidence* of works? Again, You cannot ſuppoſe that when Mr. Shirley ſaid, "Bleſſed be God, neither Mr. Weſley, nor any of his "preachers, (Mr. Olivers excepted) hold a ſecond juſtifica-"tion by works," that he intended to exclude good works in an evidential ſenſe. If, therefore, you do not mean ſomething more than this, what need was there of telling him *he wronged Mr Weſley, and his preachers, in aſſerting that they did not hold a ſecond juſtification by works.* Neither Mr. Shirley, nor I, nor any Calviniſt that I ever heard of, deny, that though a ſinner be juſtified in the ſight of God by Chriſt alone, he is *declaratively* juſtified by works, both here and at the day of judgment. Therefore, I ſay, if you utterly diſclaim all human works as the PROCURING, MERITORIOUS CAUSE of juſtification, what need was there of addreſſing Mr. Shirley as you have done? Yea, what need was there of your making this point a matter of controverſy at all? We are quite agreed, both as to the expreſſion, and as to the ſignification of it; and Mr. Shirley's ſentiments are perfectly compatible with thoſe of the DECLARATION; but I have ſtill a ſuſpicion that you are for giving man's works an higher place at the bar of God than what becomes the hand-maidens, or attendants, of a juſtified ſoul. And this I gather from your note, p. 99, where you ſay, "This "plea (that is, of free juſtification by Chriſt alone) is excel-"lent, when a man comes to Chriſt, his high prieſt, as a "ſinner, for pardon and holineſs, or for his firſt juſtification "on earth; but IT WILL BE ABSURD *when he ſtands be-"fore the throne of Chriſt as a rebellious ſubject, or before his "judgment-ſeat as a criminal, at the laſt day.*" Now it appears to me, from this note, as if a Chriſtian had two different pleas to make for his entrance into glory; the one when he firſt believes, the other when he appears before the judgment-ſeat of Chriſt: a notion, which I am perſuaded is no leſs contrary to Scripture, than it is injurious to the office and character of our great Emmanuel. If I am under an error, I hope I am open to conviction, and ſhall gladly own that I have miſunderſtood your real meaning.

The

The force of partiality I know is very great; and you muſt not take it ill if I ſay I believe this has carried you farther than you are aware of; but indeed, Sir, though I felt myſelf deeply wounded in the peruſal of your book, yet I find the greateſt reluctance in the thought of bidding adieu to all future connection with one, who, I am verily perſuaded, deſires *to do all things to the Redeemer's glory.*

God only knows what has paſſed through my heart concerning this publication: ſometimes I had well-nigh reſolved to ſuppreſs it; yea, I had thoughts of doing this when it was almoſt all printed off; and this, for no other reaſon, but becauſe I was unwilling to bear too hard upon ſome, whom, notwithſtanding all their inconſiſtencies and contradictory aſſertions, I believe are yet ſincere at the bottom, and with whom I hope to live for ever in glory. But when I conſidered the great duplicity of Mr. Weſley's conduct in embracing Mr. Shirley as a friend at the Conference, and then directly going out from thence to give the ſignal for war; when I called to mind his acknowledgments of the *unguarded* manner in which the Minutes were drawn up; and, that immediately afterwards, he adhered to them, and defended them in the full ſenſe of the words; above all, when I received letter after letter, to acquaint me of the unjuſt prejudices which your laſt publication had been the means of creating in the minds of many againſt the faithful laborious miniſters of the Goſpel; I ſay, when I conſidered theſe things, I was more than ever convinced, that abſolute duty called upon me to ſend this piece abroad into the world: in doing of which, I ſhould be extremely ſorry to grieve any perſons in connection with Mr. Weſley, when the Searcher of Hearts knoweth I mean only to put them upon ſeeing with their own eyes, and examining for themſelves. Such of them as have candidly read my letters throughout will bear me witneſs, that I have ſpoken in terms of brotherly love and Chriſtian reſpect, as well towards them, as towards the *body* of lay preachers; being fully perſuaded, that the truly-excellent of the earth are to be found among both. And if I know any thing of my own heart (or may judge of it from my Five Letters, lately publiſhed in anſwer to your firſt book,) wherever I have ſprinked the leaſt *grain of ſalt*, it has been with no other view than that of ſhewing my learned competitor his own face in his own glaſs, and with the hopes of bringing him to a proper abhorrence of that in himſelf which his own piety and good ſenſe (abſtracted from that ſelf-love which is too apt to caſt a miſt before the eyes of the beſt of men) cannot help condemning in others. For, to uſe the words of Mr. Hervey, in his

his letters to Mr. Weſley, " The contemptuous and reproach-
" ful, even when really deſerved, can have no tendency to
" confirm our argument, but to provoke reſentment. They
" are not the moſt promiſing means of joining us together in
" one mind and judgment; but rather the ſure way to widen
" the breach, and increaſe animoſity."

Wiſhing you a plentiful increaſe of every Goſpel grace, and that the Lord of the harveſt may vouchſafe his efficacious bleſſing upon all your labors, begun, continued, and ended in him, I conclude,

Reverend and dear Sir,

Your ſincere Friend in the Goſpel of Chriſt,

The Author of P. O.

F I N I S.

Juſt Publiſhed,

A New Edition of the FIVE LETTERS to Mr. F——r, Corrected and much enlarged, Price 9d.

The PARIS CONVERSATION concerning Mr. Weſley's Minutes, Second Edition, Price 3d.

The Sixth Edition, much enlarged, of AN ADDRESS TO PERSONS OF FASHION, concerning Balls, Plays, Cards, &c. Price *bound* 2s.